NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

Without Concealment-----Without Compromise.

VOLUME VII.---NO. 44. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 1, 1847. WHOLE NUMBER 356.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN A. S. SOCIETY.
At 142 Nassau Street, New-York.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to the Editor.

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or to S. H. Gay, Assistant Treasurer, at New-York.

TERMS.—One Dollar per annum: Strictly in advance in all cases.

H. M. HENRY, PRINTER.

Pro-Slavery.

The following letter to the (Dublin) Nation, from a Catholic Priest, and Young Irelander, is that referred to by R. D. Webb, in his last letter. We have not been able to find room for it earlier:

REV. MR. KENYON—THE CONFEDERATION.

CHAPEL HOUSE, TEMPLEDERRY, Jan. 19, 1847.

To the Editor of the Nation:

MY DEAR SIR:—Your number of Saturday was indeed a treat. It breathes such a Repeal spirit from every teeming page, as our witches of the Hall will not conjure out of their black-letter law books till they can read backwards, I warrant them. Only two passages of the glorious Confederation seem to me open to exception. One is contained in Mr. O'Gorman's resolution, where it gives unlimited power to the original members of the Council to add to their numbers, and especially where it makes Members of Parliament, clergymen, and magistrates, (becoming members,) *ex-officio* members of the Council. The other is contained in Mr. Haughton's speech, "where he would indignantly refuse the blood-stained contributions of American slaveholders," &c. With that freedom which shall constitute, I hope, the badge and strength of our Confederation, and which, I also hope, shall insure its success, I mean to discuss these passages, under favour of the Irish party.

Mr. Haughton is, of course, entitled to hold his opinion. I can respect the highest instinct of liberty, the keen resentment of wrong, which has led him to embrace it so warmly—which would lead him to enact it at any sacrifice. But I sincerely trust the Council of our Confederation will not adopt it. It is quite an error to suppose that our great and noble cause would be polluted by receiving such contributions, or that it must not be injured by rejecting them. It is precisely one of the notable blunders of the late Repeal Association. It may be an extreme case—Mr. Haughton, I doubt not, so considers it—but if the case were made an hundred-fold worse; if, instead of slaveholders, slave-eaters were substituted in the argument, I should still accept their aid, and thank them for it, to repeal this abominable Union. Turks, Pagans, Atheists, Cannibals, Thugs, Parias, Chartists, Loupgarous, (unless they were indisputable devils,) beggars, or borrowers of money—I would accept honest help from all, and think myself never the worse therefor. Here are some of my reasons.

If I was drowning, or good Mr. Haughton, if you were drowning in, let us say, the Ganges, and that one of the Thugs aforesaid, who might chance to be on his travels at the time, offered you an end of the most inconsistent walking-stuck imaginable, to help you out of your strait, would you spurn the offer, spit in the decent man's face, and choose rather to feed a pair of crocodiles, from sheer, virtuous indignation? Indeed, Mr. Haughton, you would not; and I question much if you would even select the exact moment when you were crawling up the bank, for preaching him a harsh lecture upon Thuggery in general. Now, where is the difference? Money is the algebraist's *x*; it may represent anything; let it stand, then, for a walking-stick. Be the slaveholders of America Thugs for the nonce; or Thuggers, if you prefer it. Let the Union be the gulf, and Lord John Russell the pair of crocodiles; and there's an end on 't.

Again: if slaveholding be a great crime, daily drunkenness is no joking matter, as you yourself, Mr. Haughton, very sensibly feel. There are, in fact, several offences condemned in Holy Writ, and censured by the Church and the world, at least, as expressly, as this vice of slaveholding. How does it happen that the aid, pecuniary or other, of these latter delinquents, is understood to imply no guilt in those who merely receive it, while the salveholder's gold is so fraught with contamination? Answer, good Mr. Haughton; but do not, I beseech you, answer disputatiously; do not curl at my tone, for it is a mere trick of the pen, I assure you; but reflect before you answer; apply your honest judgment to the point, and you will, I trust, acknowledge that there is an inconsistency in the policy you recommend; that the enthusiasm of your ardent mind has betrayed you into an error of opinion; and that the sooner this error is corrected the better.

Hitherto I have assumed slaveholding to be not only a crime, but a crime of the first magnitude. But it was only for the sake of argument. I am by no means prepared to admit the fact. The Scriptures nowhere formally condemn this crime. The Church has never defined it to be such. Priests and bishops maintain communion with slaveholders, unblamed. They have themselves owned slaves.—They may own some yet for all I know to the contrary. I covet not, indeed, their property; but I will not condemn them for it, either. Much less will I consent to hold them excommunicate. It has been observed with equal truth and feeling that even the fallen should retain some claim to the forbearance of a fallen race. It may be that slaveholding will be eliminated from Christendom by our fashionable theory of developments. It may be that it will not. It may be that it will evanish from the earth more naturally, and with less offence to the spirits of defunct scholastics, by the mere influence of spreading civilization. It may be too, that it will not. The coil is more tangled, I apprehend, and contains more knots than honest Mr. Haughton might have imagined.

If slaveholding, for instance, were held to be criminal, the crime should affect both parties in the transaction. Wilful slavery must then be a sin. Now, al hough I have asserted, against the advocates of passive obedience, the right of a slave to free himself if he can—aye, even by physical force—I have no notion whatever of condensing that right into a duty. Everything lawful is not expedient; much less obligatory. Christian patience is a virtue, how much soever ignorant Christians discredit it by false expositions of its nature. And, even against the eloquent and entrancing strain of Mr. Holmes's lofty argument, I shall maintain inviolate the right of voluntary mortification to free exercise within its legitimate sphere. But this, perhaps, is carrying the joke too far.

In general, I regard the whole question as one whose importance is much exaggerated by fancy; perchance, by fanaticism. We are all slaves, in a thousand senses of the word: slaves to time, to space, to circumstance; to the habits of our great-grandfathers on either side, and to the whims of our maternal ancestors in all their nonsensical generations; to fire, air, earth, and water, throughout all their analyses: to tailors—a most galling yoke—snuff, washer-women, quacks, policemen, umbrellas, London merchants, native millers, and royal engineers. If to all these slaveries there be superadded one other, namely, slavery to slaveholders, I cannot see that our position will be very essentially deteriorated. But, at all events, flinging back bags of dollars over the Atlantic ocean into the pockets of these very slaveholders, enriching them at our present expense, is such an Utopian remedy for the supposed evil as only homœopathists could countenance.

Let us, then, Mr. Haughton, in the name of common sense, mind, for the present, our own proper business. Let us not go so far out of our way, and at such considerable inconvenience, to knock our heads against this theoretical post. Perhaps it is a mere eyesore in this world. If it be an evil, which, mind, I have not directly denied, though I will by no means affirm it, it penetrates deeper into human history, human nature, and human society, than our folly can fathom, or than any folly can prevent. If it be an evil, let us prove it first to the slaveholder, with the aid of their own money, after the Union is repealed, and then set about abating it with our surplus funds. If it be an evil, it is no special concern of ours; we shall not be damned for it, though we take useful coins from the evil doers, no more than for the Thuggery of the man that may have rescued us from the crocodiles, no more than for any other inordinate habits of our members. If it be an evil, may God mend it. I hope the Council of our Confederation will just answer—Amen.

Whether this Council ought to consist of a definite or an unlimited number is a question so nice that I would not choose to discuss it, if assured that it had been considerately decided. Being ignorant of that fact, I will merely submit for the present my strong predilection for a determinate number. But the clause of our Constitution which makes members of Parliament, clergymen, and magistrates (becoming members) *ex-officio* members of the Council, I shall expunge, if I can, before the ink with which it was written has time to harden. It is a vicious principle: a remnant of the effete routine which we have abandoned, clinging to us, I would hope, unconsciously. What are members of Parliament, clergymen, or magistrates, as such? What they ought to be is plain enough, but irrelevant to the issue. What they are as such; that is, what they may be, is the question. They may be knaves, or dolts, or cowards: and are knaves, or dolts, or cowards to be members, *ex-officio;* that is, by virtue of their knavery, noodlehood, or poltroonery, of that Council, which is embodied to achieve the freedom of this land? No! no! Let us have no more *ex officios*. Have any numbers of men, limited or unlimited, if it must be so, on your council: but let them be all, at least, men. Let us be sure of that much. The land is sick of *ex-officios*.

Mr. O'Connell sneers at us because we are only men—connected with a newspaper, called THE NATION. Shall we shrink from the sneer within the shelter of lawn or ermine? No! we shall rather stand upon our manhood; for only manhood can now avail us. When title is superadded, we shall render it all meet respect; but we shall worship golden calves no longer.

I conclude, for the special amusement of the *Waterford Chronicle*, the funniest dog in all old Ireland, (the *Pilot and Tipperary Vindicator* being of the sulky species,) as well as for the instruction of our Council, with a sentiment from a peninsular poet, who was, moreover, a patriot and a man:—

Todo rey nacio hombre,
Los dictados vini ron despues:
Estimemos el hombre por juste
No por ser conde ni marques.

And remain, my dear Sir,
Very faithfully Yours,
JOHN KENYON, R. C. C.

Selections.

From the Nation.

NEGRO SLAVERY.—MR. HAUGHTON.

35, ECCLES STREET, 15th Feb. 1847.

DEAR SIR:—You are right in concluding that the controversy between me and Mr. Kenyon is at an end; at least, to all present appearances, there seems little likelihood that it will be renewed. I am quite willing to leave the matter at issue between us, to the calm decision of the Irish people. If I could have a doubt as to what the decision will be, I should indeed despair of my country. The Rev. Mr. Kenyon is the extenuator, if not the actual advocate, of Slavery. I am its opponent in all its shapes and forms. Let the people judge between us. Some years ago, I was made the medium of communicating to the people of Ireland, through the Repeal Association, an address from the friends of liberty in the United States. That honourable commission constituted me, in a measure, the representative to my countrymen of the three millions of down-trodden human beings in that land. God helping me, I will continue faithfully to oppose their oppressors on every fitting occasion that offers.

I take my pen now to correct an error or two into which Mr. Kenyon has fallen. He says, speaking of the Council of the Irish Confederation, "They will not commit the impolitic folly of refusing good money to aid them in their struggle, from whatever quarter of the globe good minds shall blow it."

I wish to tell the Irish people that their "youthful Council" have come to no such destructive resolution; and it is my hope and prayer, that if they should be tempted by American "soul-drivers," they will nobly resist the temptation. Better to struggle on in virtuous poverty, than to ruin our cause by linking hands with men-stealers. Bear in mind, countrymen, I do not object to good money from *good minds*. My desire is to save our own minds from the pollution. It seems to me, that our success in our present efforts depends, and that it ought to depend, on our fidelity to the principles of liberty.

Mr. Kenyon says I insinuated a charge against him; this is an error. I insinuated nothing. My letter is a plain opposition to his morals on the subject of Slavery. But he insinuates a charge against me which he is bound to prove or retract. He says, if "I should venture to condemn other classes of prevaricators, whom it may not suit his particular humour to discountenance, he might be the first man and the loudest, to cry bigot in my teeth." Let Mr. Kenyon point out any prevarication or falsehood, or any outrage upon truth and justice which I will not condemn, and let me be denounced as recreant to principle if I be silent, or if I uphold the wrong.

Permit me now to have a little word of controversy with yourself. You appear to me to have mistaken me altogether; and I own I am surprised at the error into which you have fallen. You are under the impression that I am a sort of enthusiastic Don Quixote, willing at all times to run a tilt against the monster Slavery, and that I have done so in the instance, which has called forth the present correspondence, (a correspondence by the way, in which I think we should rejoice, because of its tendency to give rise to thoughtfulness in the minds of the people.) In a word, your remarks convey the notion that I have made the matter to which I alluded, or that it really is a matter or question of American Slavery, and not a question of Irish freedom. This is a complete mistake. In recommending that we should refuse blood-stained money, I had reference to Irish freedom, to Irish independence, and to Irish honour. I believe all these would be compromised by any, the least, communion with slaveholders, unless at the moment we received their proffered assistance, we the more boldly denounced their own dereliction of the principles of freedom and virtue. As well might we expect from the venal voter an honest reproof of his tempter, as that an association, who accepted pecuniary aid from men-stealers, should manfully upbraid them for their crimes. If this could be done, I would accept the money. But the thing is all but impossible. Stern virtue would cower beneath the fiend expediency.

You say you will not have anything to do with abolition. I am sorry you say so; but I did not moot that question at all on the occasion referred to. I should rather see that question brought forward at a special meeting of the Confederation, than introduced incidentally at a meeting convened for other purposes. But I do hope to see that question, and the question of peace, and capital punishment, and teetotalism, and all other questions relating to man's well-being, discussed by us, as the very best means of educating Irishmen in those principles of truth and justice, which can alone fit us for freedom, and make us a great and noble people. Let it be the great business of the Irish Confederation to call their friends together to hear lectures delivered on all subjects pertaining to human happiness. There are minds and intellects among us fully capable of the performance of these duties. I say, let them be performed, and Ireland will rise—freedom will triumph.

You say, "If negro slavery be an evil." Why put the question hypothetically? Have you any doubt about it. Recollect, I did not bring the question forward; my proposition was one relating to the expediency or honesty of taking money from slaveholders, to aid the cause of Irish independence. You have referred to the broad question of Slavery itself, and I am glad you have done so. But I am very sorry indeed, that you do not think we have time to spare to spend on the question. Why, the question is vital to us; we sustain Slavery, both directly and indirectly, in the United States. Many Irishmen there hold slaves; all Irishmen at home, use slave-grown produce, which is stolen goods, in the shape of cotton goods, and tobacco. Would we not wear and consume these articles with happier feelings if they were the products of free labour? I think we would. We have, as lovers of liberty, as co-labourers in the cause of nationality, a direct interest in the abolition of American Slavery. I only ask that we shall act on the wicked system indirectly by moral and peaceful means. It seems to me, that you might as wisely and logically argue against putting food into the stomach to sustain the body, on the ground that no better occupation of our time, than decline, for that reason, leading the Irish people to discuss the first principles of human liberty. This would seem to me an equally suicidal policy. We are labouring for National Independence. The way, as it seems to me, to secure that desirable object, and to make it really beneficial to our country, when it is attained, is, to lend a helping hand, as we go along, to the promotion of virtue and happiness on earth.

I hope, my dear Sir, I shall not soon again have to trespass on your patience or your space,

And I remain yours faithfully,
JAMES HAUGHTON.

ABOLITION OF SLAVERY IN TURKEY.—The correspondent of a French paper writes from Constantinople, on the 20th ultimo:—"The Sultan himself presided at a sitting of the Supreme Council of Justice, all the ministers and high functionaries being present. The Sultan himself proposed a measure, which will produce a great sensation in Europe, namely, to issue an ordonnance for the suppression of the slave market. This is not indeed a suppression of Slavery altogether, but it is a first step towards it. The Koran, it is true, admits of Slavery, but it is only in tolerance, for it at the same time recommends the enfranchisement of slaves as a meritorious action; and the rich Mussulmen, at their great family festivals, or before setting out on a long journey, and indeed at any important event of their lives, believe they cannot do anything more agreeable to God than to give a slave his freedom. The obstacles to general emancipation arise rather from the customs and manners of the Turks than from religious prejudices; and, from the moment the Sultan sets the example, it will meet with ready imitation. The Bey of Tunis has already abolished Slavery in his regency; and Ibrahim Pacha, on his return from Europe, gave freedom to all his slaves, without either of these acts producing the least mark of disapprobation of the Mussulmen States. All the world knows that in these States the slaves form part of the family to which they belong, and that many reach important stations. Two of the present ministers of the Sultan, Kosrew Pacha and Hafiz Pacha, are freed slaves; so were the late Governor of Trebisond, son-in-law of Sultan Mahmoud, Halil Pacha, Mehemet Reschid Pacha, Commander-in-Chief of the army of Arabia, and many others. The mother of the Sultan and all his wives were Circassian or Georgian slaves, who have been enfranchised. The whole question turns on this point, that no man can hold a right over the freedom of a fellow-creature."

ANTI-SLAVERY LEAGUE.—A public meeting of this association was held on Wednesday, at the Hall of Commerce, Threadneedle street, D. W. Wire, Esq. in the chair, on the subject of American Slavery. The chairman, in opening the business, said that the meeting was convened for the purpose of interesting the public of this country in behalf of the slaves of the United States. The question was an important one, and commended itself to the sympathies and best wishes of every Englishman. (Hear, hear.) He trusted the meeting would listen attentively to the statements which would be laid before it by the delegates who were to address the audience. The chairman then called upon Mr. R. Smith, the Secretary of the League, who dwelt upon the relation which England sustained towards the United States. He showed the influence which this country exerted upon the public of the American Union, by reference to the constant intercourse—social, commercial, and religious—which is maintained. He then referred to the influence of the slaveholders in all departments of activity, to prove that the politics and religion of the nation were overridden by the pro-slavery spirit. The Constitution of the United States gave to every slaveholder three votes for every five slaves, which were to him, in every other respect, only what the sheep and cattle were to the resident in the North. Mr. Smith concluded with a powerful appeal to the justice, humanity, and religion of the British community. Mr. Frederick Douglass (recently an American slave) then addressed the meeting in an eloquent and powerful speech, and concluded by calling on the meeting and Christians of all denominations to avow no fellowship with slaveholders, a sentiment which was heartily responded to. The chairman, in acknowledging a vote of thanks, commended the Anti-Slavery League to the support of every one who desired the extension of human happiness and the extinction of human misery.

A HARD CASE.

Notwithstanding all our professions of liberality and boasting of the progress our age has made in conquering ancient prejudices, and removing the wrecks of worn out institutions, we occasionally meet with instances which make us pause and ask ourselves if we are really in the nineteenth century. A case has recently come to our knowledge, which strikes us as a most humiliating proof of the narrow views which still pervade our social and political systems.—We are acquainted with a young man in this city, for whose character we entertain a very high respect. We have always discovered in him the deportment of a gentleman, and we know he is a scholar. He is a regular graduate of one of our colleges, having taken his degree with honor. He is a first rate linguist—being familiar with the ancient as well as modern languages. He is a man of mind--of prepossessing and amiable manners, and of unimpeached character. After having graduated, he spent two years in the study of the law with one of the most profound lawyers in the state or country: who expressed himself delighted with the successful attempts of his student to master the intricacies of the law. In time the young man was duly qualified, and application was made for his admission to practice. Nor can any reader imagine why his offer was at once rejected, and the young scholar refused the privilege of enrolling his name as an attorney at law? It was not on account of any of any objection that could be made against him, either on the score of conduct or qualifications.

His father is a respectable man, who toiled his life-time to give his child his education and profession. It is not that he is either a foreigner or the son of a foreigner. He is a native born Pennsylvanian, and his ancestors are old in our country. Why then was his admission refused? You give it up?—Well, we will enlighten you: *because he is a colored man!* The young man's name is G. B. Vashon. He is a son of Mr. J. B. Vashon, a highly respectable colored man of this city.

Here are we in the full blaze of civilization, bemoaning the abject condition of an unhappy race; and when an individual of that race whose efforts at self-improvement, mark him as worthy of all men's regard, we shut the door against, and bid him go hence, for he is of another and a baser race! Do we not need improvement in these things? What man who has a heart in him would spurn at this young man's laudable ambition? Yet spurned he is from our Courts of Justice? He has been definitely refused admission to practice, and is now, we believe, going to New York State, to try his fortune. May success attend him.

His refusal is not to be charged against our bar, than which a more liberal is not to be found in the State; but in our laws and institutions which deny the rights of citizenship to the colored man. —*Pittsburgh Journal.*

From the Liberator.

STRAINING AT A GNAT.

When we see a class of professed reformers magnifying mole-hills into mountains, and reducing mountains to the size of mole-hills—straining at gnats, and swallowing camels—gravely affirming that small evils are the greatest of all evils, and that unmitigated and all-devouring oppression is far more tolerable than toil-worn freedom,—we are constrained either to impeach their intelligence, or to suspect their honesty; and, whether grossly ignorant, or perversely knavish, we can place no confidence in their principles or measures. Such a class exists in New-York, and has for its organ a paper called "Young America." In this paper, we observe a constant disposition to sneer at the Anti-Slavery enterprize, and to represent the condition of the white laboring classes generally, as far more deplorable than that of the southern slaves! For instance—in a late number, this language is held:—'Those well-meaning but *mistaken enthusiasts*, who have so zealously striven in this country to substitute Wages for Chattel Slavery, will be enlightened in spite of their prejudices, and made fully sensible of the short-coming of their plans.' Again: 'the Wages and Tenant system' is declared to be 'so much more heinous than the Chattel system of the South, as almost to defy comparison'! Who can believe that the author of such stuff, if he is not stark, staring mad, sincerely credits what he utters? To say that it is worse for a man to be free, than to be a slave—worse to work for whom he pleases, when he pleases, and where he pleases, than to be compelled to toil under the lash of a slave-driver—worse to make his own contracts, and to receive the amount of wages he has stipulated for, than to be seized and worked without any remuneration—worse to be regarded as a poor laboring man, than as a marketable commodity—worse to encounter the vicissitudes of a state of personal freedom, than to endure the horrors of Chattel Slavery—worse to stand equal with all others in the eye of the law, than to be doomed by law to all conceivable outrages, without the possibility of redress—worse to pay wages than to pay none;—to make declarations like these, is to insult the understanding of every sane man, and to destroy all confidence in the man who is not ashamed to be their author. As the publisher of "Young America" is himself an employer, does he mean to say that he is a villain, because he pays stipulated wages to those whom he employs? Is he worse than a southern man-stealer? And because there are those in his office whom he employs on contract, does he mean to say that they are *therefore* in a condition more lamentable than that of the plundered slave population? Out upon such folly!

"Young America" raises a great outcry against 'land monopoly.' This monopoly is undeniably wicked and disastrous: the sooner it is broken up the better. But what hope, nay, what possibility is there, that, in a nation where it is reputable to steal men, the right of every man to a just portion of the soil will be conceded and enjoyed? it is absurd for that paper to say, "The shortest way to abolish slavery, of every form, is by preventing any one man from owning two men's portions of the earth.' This equalization can never take place, so long as one man is allowed the power of owning two or five hundred MEN. The deliverance of the SLAVE must necessarily precede the redemption of the LAND.

From the Independent Democrat.

THE OMITTED CLAUSE.

In the original draft of the Declaration of Independence, as drawn up by JEFFERSON, was a strong condemnation of the British King for conniving at and encouraging the *African Slave-Trade;* a condemnation that can well be applied to the American Government, which is now seeking to revive a similar commerce between the slave breeding States of the South and the free soil of California, &c. The following is the omitted clause, which was stricken out in compliance to South Carolina and Georgia. For the particulars of that transaction see Madison papers, Vol. 1, pp. 233.

"He," (that is, the King of England,) "has incited treasonable insurrections of our fellow-citizens, with the allurements of forfeiture and confiscation of our property. He has waged cruel war against nature itself, violating its most sacred rights of life and liberty in the persons of a distant people who never offended him; captivating and carrying them into slavery in another hemisphere, or to incur miserable death in their transportation thither. This piratical warfare, the opprobrium of infidel powers, is the warfare of the Christian King of Great Britain. Determined to keep up a market where men should be bought and sold, he has prostituted his negative for suppressing every legislative attempt to prohibit or restrain this *execrable commerce;* and that this assemblage of horrors might want no fact of distinguished dye, he is now exciting these very people to raise in arms among us, and to purchase that liberty of which he has also obtruded them; thus paying off former crimes committed against the liberties of one people, with crimes which he urges them to commit against the lives of another."

Communications.

CAZENOVIA ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

[CONCLUDED.]

EVENING SESSION.—President called the Convention to order. The 25th chapter of Ezekiel read—and F. Hawley offered prayer.

R. Thomas, Esq. of Cazenovia, resumed the discussion, taking the negative. He said he was proud of his position—I stand here on my individual responsibility. I am not a Liberty party man; I belong to quite a different party, and hope it will receive such accessions from the Liberty party before another election, as shall enable it to redeem our country.

I regret to have heard, from the gentleman who preceded me, reflections on the Father of our country, who was held up not only as a slaveholder, but a slave-catcher. He entertained no doubt but that Washington was actuated by the kindest and most fraternal regard for his slave that he pursued. He could not allow such an aspersion to go unrebuked. He thought the framers of the Declaration of Independence deprecated Slavery; in the original draft they introduced a clause condemning King George for giving countenance to Slavery.

The fact of their holding slaves was not a fair criterion by which we should judge those men; it did not serve as a true test of character. On this ground Henry Clay had been much abused; all his other noble qualities had been thrown away. Jesus Christ and his apostles found Slavery existing in their field of operations, and yet left it unrebuked. I wish to quote a little Scripture, and read: "Let as many servants as are under the yoke," &c. Is this revolutionary doctrine? Do we find this revolutionary principle set forth in Scripture?

Were not our revolutionary fathers kind to their slaves? He who fought for our country in its revolutionary struggles, and who presided over the Convention which framed the Constitution, was he a petty tyrant? Did he not rather send for the fugitive out of feelings of charity and fraternal regard? He desired to call the attention of his audience to one point, that all civil Governments were necessarily imperfect. In what Government do we find all men equal, and every right secure? The Government most stable and yet least desirable is that of Great Britain, having for its main principle the right of conquest, which is contrary to every principle of justice; and who is unacquainted with the poverty and wretchedness of a great class of the people in that country? A revolution would doubtless bring about a better state of things in that Government, but he would oppose it, even there. He believed that error was harmless where reason was left free to combat it. What were the fruits of the revolution in France, or of reverting to first principles?

There the Dantons, the Robespieres, in their speeches were filled with the most enlarged philanthropy, and yet behold the gulf of ruin they led to. Think of the sufferings of Louis?

Those very philanthropists, were not satisfied with the blood of Louis and his family, but demanded the lives of all the holy priests, and the extermination of all that was good and lovely. All this was the result of reverting to first principles. I would gladly encourage this expansive philanthropy in behalf of the Africans, but must have a regard to others interest which would be destroyed by such revolutionary movements. What brought about emancipation in Great Britain, which was effectual, and yet legal? He would readily accord to the Abolitionists, every benefit which they could derive from the example of Great Britain.

But does the responsibility of Slavery in these United States rests upon us? Thomas Jefferson threw it back upon the parent country. It is claimed the Constitution is pro-slavery. It should be supported whatever may be its character. Is it our duty to dissolve the Union to remedy it? Apply this principle to the physical constitution if any portion is diseased, and the life of the person must be destroyed. This is the conclusion men arrive at who revert to first principles. He was glad to understand from the speech of Mr. Ward and from Goodell, that the Constitution was susceptible of an Anti-Slavery construction to a certain extent, though he had no doubt as to the design of its framers The clause alleged to mean fugitive slaves may refer to that class in the clause respecting representatives, "held to service for a term of years." He was glad to get light on this subject, though Mr. Goodell went too far in his work.

The Constitution is sufficiently Anti-Slavery to absolve us from guilt. Congress has power to abolish Slavery in the District of Columbia. The Constitution should be perpetuated. The time had not come, and he trusted never would, for a dissolution of the Union. He had several reasons for thus speaking. The signs of the times are auspicious. He saw a glorious period dawning. The Anti-Slavery sentiment is progressing in the political parties in our country. How long has it been since Abolitionists were regarded as outlaws. Witness the strife in Congress, the Wilmot proviso passing through the House. May we not hope? How long will it be before new States will spring up in Oregon like exhalations, and give the free States an ascendency over the slave States?

If the Union is dissolved will it not leave the Southwestern States to enlarge their slaveholding States as they see fit?

Would not insurrections, a servile war, extermination of the blacks, follow disunion? Would there not be enough loyalty among the slaves toward their masters to enable them to hold on to their slaves without the aid of the North? What is the Union worth? Without it our country would now be an unbroken wilderness. We should have no national road—no light-houses—no navigable rivers—no harbours—all these are the results of the Union.

If the Union continues, and new States spring up in the west, may we not expect the Capital will be removed on to free soil?

I wonder that Abolitionists have not directed their efforts more to this object. Public opinion is turning against Slavery, and disunion is not called for. It is not called for because of any guilt we incur in it compared with the good resulting from it. I regard the parting admonition of Washington too highly to countenance such a movement. I express the sentiments of the Whig party. The Liberty men ought to unite with us; they cannot succeed as a party; some of them are tariff men, some anti-tariff and they will go to their old parties.

The patriotism of the working men is too strong for their country to countenance such a gloomy measure as disunion.

Joseph C. Hathaway followed Mr. Thomas, and said he had been entertained in listening to the gentleman's remarks who had just taken his seat. There was a wide gulf between them. He should not in his reply try to prove Slavery right or even tolerable from the Bible. He would say in the language of Patrick Henry, "give me Liberty or give me death." Give me Liberty with a crust of bread, rather than be a pampered slave It was no pleasant duty to speak of the character of Washington. It was of little importance to him how Washington treated his slaves; it was enough for him to know that he held men as slaves. Why did those framers of the Declaration of Independence strike out the clause respecting the countenance King George gave to the Slave Trade? It was because the spirit of Liberty did not pulsate in their breasts as high as it should.

How does the gentleman undertake to cleanse the fathers from the stigma of being revolutionists, with his theory, that "error is harmless if reason is left free to combat it."

Did our fathers thus think and act? No, they reverted to first principles, and went for disunion; waged a seven years' war, and waded in blood. I justify their positions, not their measures. I go for disunion because I am a Republican. This Government is anti-republican. I go for disunion because I am a Democrat. This Government is anti-democratic. I go for disunion because this Government acts in contravention of the laws of God and the principles of the Gospel. I can't maintain my integrity and remain in this Union. I owe allegiance more to God than to the laws of my dead fathers.

This Union is cemented with the blood of the slave; there could be no Union without that cementing principle. This subject caused more debate and trouble than all others, and was reconciled by the dernier resort of Benjamin Franklin, who proposed going to praying. A large minority refused to sign their names to the Constitution in consequence of its pro-slavery character.

Mr. H. read here a portion of the speech of John Quincy Adams setting forth his views respecting the character of the Constitution, as prescribed by the slaveholding lords of the South.

I go for dissolution on this same ground. Allusion has been made to Great Britain. I grant that Government is oppressive, and that is the character of their laws, and while I admit this, I look at home, and find three millions of slaves, held in chains by three hundred thousand despots—exercising a far greater despotism than Queen Victoria.

Let her attempt to ape despots in America; let Prince Albert attempt to enslave the child, tearing it from the bosom of its mother, and it would cost him his head. And yet in democratic America, we have three hundred thousand kings and queens, who are doing such daring deeds daily. I remember Frederick Douglass. Who is he? An American slave! What is the late intelligence from Great Britain? Why, Englishmen, living under a monarchy, are putting their hands into their pockets, and purchasing an American born citizen, to make him free! Great Britain, with all her faults, has given freedom to her slaves, while the United States stand out this shame, holding on to their slaves. I go for disunion, for we now have no Union in fact, only in name. Can we go South and enjoy the freedom of speech and liberty of the press? No. We have no Union but with the halter. Why hold on to the form when the power is gone? I challenge any man to put his finger upon one single act of this nation, in which Slavery and Liberty conflicted, but that the latter was compelled to kick the beam. Can we be true to the principles of freedom, for which our fathers fought, and continue in union with slaveholders? Consider who have been the principal officers in this Government for the last forty years—the character of its treaties with the Indians—the battles fought, and money expended for Slavery—the sacrifices of Northern interests, morals, and character, to further the slave power. And shall we continue in union with such a system any longer!

I go for Disunion on the authority of the influential Whigs of the North, J. Q. Adams, Briggs, Slade, Gates, and Giddings, those men who declared that if Texas was annexed, and we submitted, we should be particeps criminis. Have not Northern people submitted, and are they not particeps criminis? We are doing what those men said we ought to do! How much longer shall we allow freedom of speech and press to be trampled upon! How much longer shall we allow the South to brand and imprison our innocent men and women? to incarcerate them with felons, and to die in their prison cells? How much longer shall we allow these outrages to be committed, and send our young men to Mexico, to leave there their bones to bleach, all for the perpetuity of the slave system! I call upon the North to withdraw its influence and support from the South, and then if the South will not let the slaves go free, I brand that man as a craven coward who will not fight for himself, and refuse to take up arms for the slave, "one hour of whose condition is fraught with more misery, than ages of that which our fathers rose up in rebellion to oppose."

Mr. Thomas followed, in a few remarks, mainly a repetition of his first speech. On the consequences of such a revolutionary course.

Mr. Remond offered the closing speech. He said that the friend mistook the feelings of himself and friends if he supposed we should be mortified in being defeated in a vote on the resolution. We were not actuated by expediency, usages, &c. but were seeking after the truth; whether we were in the majority or minority. Our friend T. urges upon us the consequences, &c. He thought if the friend was not satisfied with what had been said on the affirmative, that the friend had failed to draw rational deductions. I believe that emancipation would follow Disunion, and not extermination. He had the testimony of Southerners to favour his belief. I say, however, that if the South now would be so rash and fool-hardy as to hold on to their slaves, and a war should follow, the consequences would be theirs, not ours. Duty is ours, not consequences. We owe it to ourselves to carry out this measure. I can see in the dim distance, consequences more dreadful from a continuance of the slave system. What caused such a change to come over the dreams of Calhoun in the prospective war with Great Britain, on the Oregon question, but that the influence it would have upon their slave system. Could we now cope with her as we did in the last war, while she was slaveholding? Those that were her slaves and her enemies, have become free and now her friends. The refugees that have fled from this glorious Union, and rally around Queen Victoria's flag, and the Indians on our frontier would not be likely to take side with this Government against Great Britain. Then for the safety of our country, we advocate action in favour of this resolution. Let the experience of the past, as well as that of the present, testify respecting our duty touching this resolution. We have been asked to wait and see the result of this "Wilmot proviso," in favour of our philanthropic enterprise. Have we not waited already too long? If under the auspices of Washington, and Adams, and their sons, Slavery could find favour, and increase from seven hundred thousand to three millions,—if their influence could not stay its progress, its onward march, what have we to expect from the influence of those humble individuals who are advocating the Union to stay it? If I was a slave, I am quite sure I should think we had waited long enough! Place yourselves in the condition of the slave and the free coloured population of this land, and then act, and I will risk the vote.

The resolution was negatived, principally by Liberty party men, the mass of the audience not voting either way. Mr. Remond addressed a few words on the progress of our cause, and closed, by reading the ludicrous and self-contradicting petition of Patrick

O'Conner, and said, were it not for the like ludicrous and self-contradictory course of the people of these United States, we should not have occasion to ask for any such Anti-Slavery action. Whereupon the Convention adjourned, sine die.

MARY SPRINGSTEAD, Sec'y.

CAZENOVIA, Feb. 19th, 1847.

The Guilt of England.

LETTER No. I.

Sidney E. Morse Esq. one of the Editors of "The New York Observer:"

WILLIAMSBURGH, (L. I.) March 29, 1847.

SIR:—On the twenty-fifth instant, the "Journal of Commerce" of that date, was put into my hands, containing, on the 1st page, a letter of yours, first published in Edinburgh, in July last, whose object appears to be, to enforce the oft-repeated assertion, that Slavery was entailed upon us by the *British Government*.

I claim a *privileged* right to say a few words to you on the matters of your letter. A *right*, as an Abolitionist, to endeavour to "set the *right saddles* on the *right horses*," and a *privilege*, as an Englishman, to speak of this matter with somewhat of that measured warmth which every man, whose heart is in the right place, *must* feel, and *would* feel, if he believed his own mother basely slandered.

In this case I can perceive that "*the farthest way round is the nearest way home.*" Though born in England, I have lived more than fifty years in this vicinity, and can assure you, that similar statements to yours have been made before now. Rather more than two years ago, one of the most respectable of the citizens of this village—venerable both by reason of his years, and the sacred functions exercised by him, took occasion in the public Lyceum, to travel out of his argument, in order to say, "Let an *Englishman* talk to me about slavery, and *I'll* tell *him* that *England* entailed it upon us." As there is rather a large sprinkling of Englishmen in this village, I might say a few words in relation to the good feeling, good taste, and good manners displayed in this unprovoked assault: but I forbear and only refer to it in order to say, that believing at *that time*, that the gentleman was an editor of your paper, I addressed a note for publication to the editors conjointly, dated 13th March, 1845, of which the following (though from the *first rough* draft) is, I believe, nearly a verbatim copy. That the gentleman was one of your editors, I have been since told, is my mistake. But neither the mistake, nor its correction can, in the slightest degree, affect the matters in issue between us.

NEW-YORK, March 13, 1845.

Editors of the New-York Observer:

GENTLEMEN:—Will you, or some of your intelligent correspondents, inform the public in what way, and by what methods, Slavery was entailed upon us by the English Government? A disposition is evinced in certain quarters, to gainsay this fact; and, as the subject can only be *fairly* met by talking to gainsayers from "book," I shall feel greatly obliged by reference in your columns, to such records and documents as either directly, or by plain and necessary inference, will place the matter beyond dispute.

A satisfactory elucidation of this subject would seem, in fairness, to comprehend answers to the following inquiries. *How* was Slavery *first* introduced into these colonies? Was it indeed introduced by the "Government at home," through its agents, the Colonial Governors? And if so, was *force* employed, or *irresistible influence?* How was this force, or this influence, brought to bear on the colonists, and *where* may we look for satisfactory evidence of the facts of each, or any of the cases?—Were the Colonists averse to this mode of servitude; (slavery;) and, if so, how did they *manifest* their aversion? It is not pretended that they obtained slaves without *paying* for them, and one question is, how were they *induced* to *buy?* If *averse* to buy, *how* were they *compelled* to do so; and how was the *purchase money wrung* from them? What, if any, have been the public manifestations against Slavery, while colonists, and how were these manifestations overruled, and put down? &c.

A clause in relation to this subject, was, I believe, got up for insertion in the Declaration of Independence; but omitted in the final draft of that instrument. Had it appeared there, however, it could hardly have constituted *evidence* in this matter, though it might have led to successful search for it. But that its framers abandoned it, after having brought it up, would seem *a priori*, to throw considerable doubt on the truth of the allegation itself. It is manifest that vigilant, clear-sighted, and intelligent adversaries will require evidence more definite and precise, than anything of *that* sort, to convince *them*. Therefore, any evidence that you can and will point out, and where it can probably be found, will oblige, Yours, respectfully,

SENEX.

The note, of which the foregoing is a copy, was left with one of the editors residing in this village. I do not take the Observer—not because I am unaware of the general ability with which it is conducted, but—simply because the pro-slavery Government of Gen. Jackson, and of the knot of slave holding villains who assisted him to administer it, have stripped me of almost all means of access to even ordinary means of information. But feeling interested in the fate of my request for information, I awaited the advent of your paper at the Mercantile Library for many weeks in succession, (some seven or eight, I think,) without perceiving in all that time, the slightest reference to my communication. I presume no notice *ever was* taken of it. Will you condescend to inform the public why not? Will you venture to say, that the enquiries were not pertinent and germane to the matter *then* and *now* in issue, or that they were not put in terms sufficiently respectful? I should hardly believe you capable of this, did not the extreme hardihood of assertion, manifested in the letter I am now attempting to review, prepare me for almost anything of the same kind on your part.

I beg, in conclusion of this, my first letter to you, to say, that my inquiries *were*, and *now are* made in perfect good faith. It is true I *have som* information, and of the best kind too, because it gives chapter and verse, and carries with it internal evidence of its truth. But it covers only a limited field of investigation. And though the principles of this case, like those suggested by my queries, must be felt by every man of sense, to have governed and controlled every conceivable case of the introduction of slaves into those colonies, yet what we now want is *documentary* evidence. Give us chapter and verse, and not "they ought to know;" not assertion, without the slightest attempt of proof, and then come down upon us with "if these assertions are true," &c. Give us, I repeat, documents, documents, documents. Mr. Gay permitting, I next week will set you the example, by a case contra No. 1, of your letter.

Respectfully,

P. SHAPTER.

ANTI-SLAVERY ACTION.

The following resolutions were adopted by the Milwaukie District Convention, at its late meeting in Prairieville:

Whereas, The Presbyterian and Congregational General Convention of Wisconsin, with which we stand connected, has declared '*American Slavery* to be a sin; and a sin of such magnitude that all who practice it or knowingly promote it, should be excluded from our pulpits and the fellowship of our churches.' Therefore,

Resolved, That in view of this Convention, consistency with the above declaration in regard to the *sin* of American Slavery demands of the Presbyterian and Congregational General Convention of Wisconsin, *kind, earnest* and *continued* remonstrance against the toleration of this sin by any of the Ecclesiastical bodies with which we are in practical correspondence, or by any of the institutions with which we are in any way connected.

Resolved, That in the view of the Convention, until churches, in all their relations and organizations, shall call slavery *sin* and treat it as such, they will fail to secure its overthrow.

Resolved, That this Convention recommend to the churches within its bounds, to open their doors to anti-slavery lecturers and to give their aid and countenance to such lecturers, so far as they shall urge, in a Christian manner the obligations of man, as taught in the first great commandment, and in 'the second which is like unto it: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.'

DR. DAVID J. PECK.

With pleasure we announce the graduation of an esteemed young friend David J. Peck, son of our excellent fellow-citizen, Mr. John Peck, in the Medical College of Illinois at Chicago, on the 4th instant. The Dr. will shortly be at home, where he will be loudly greeted by his friends. How much more liberal is the Medical than the faculty of Law.

When we applied for admittance into the *Automical* Rooms of Pittsburg, it was granted without a word of dissent, but here is a qualified young gentleman, whose admittance is spurned by lawyers whose profession he has studied! Just heavens! how mortifying to a man of such a mind as George B. Vashon possesses!—We thrice welcome Doctor Peck in his triumph over prejudice.—*Mystery.*

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 1, 1847.

American Anti-Slavery Society.

THIRTEENTH ANNIVERSARY.

THE THIRTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY will be held in the TABERNACLE, BROADWAY, N. Y. on TUESDAY, the 11th day of MAY. The increasing interest in the Anti-Slavery cause promises an unusually large and important meeting.—The bold encroachments of the slave power upon the rights of the North, and the active measures of the slaveholders to extend and perpetuate the curse of human bondage, are awakening the people to a sense of their position both as oppressors and oppressed. All the activity and zeal of the friends of the slave are needed to arouse the country to the conviction that the only safety of the whole PEOPLE is in adopting the principle of the American Anti-Slavery Society, of

NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS!

The place of the business meetings will be announced hereafter.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, President.

WENDELL PHILLIPS, S. H. GAY, } Secretaries.

Lysander Spooner on the Constitution.

"DOMESTIC SLAVERY IS THE MOST PROMINENT FEATURE IN THE ARISTOCRATIC COUNTENANCE OF THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTION."—GOUVERNEUR MORRIS.

In our criticism of the Constitution we have proceeded thus far on the plan of allowing Mr. Spooner to explain the rules of law in his own way, and to extend them as far as he pleases. Let us now pause a moment, and see whether any legal decisions or principles sustain him to the full extent of the rules he lays down. These are: (p. 62.)

1st. "Where words are susceptible of two meanings, one consistent, and the other inconsistent, with justice and natural right, that meaning, and *only that* meaning, which is consistent with right shall be attributed to them—unless other parts of the instrument overrule that interpretation.

2d. "Another rule is, that no *extraneous or historical evidence* shall be admitted to fix upon a statute an unjust or immoral meaning, when the words themselves of the act are susceptible of an innocent one."

The only authority he adduces in support of these is the following sentence from 2. Cranch, 390:

"Where rights are infringed, where fundamental principles are overthrown, where the general system of the law is departed from, the legislative intention must be expressed with *irresistible clearness*, to induce a Court of justice to suppose a design to effect such objects."

We see nothing here which supports the second rule laid down by Mr. Spooner. The Court hold that "the intention must be expressed with irresistible clearness," but say nothing of the *means* by which they will arrive at such irresistible certainty as to the intention of the legislator, whether they shall be exclusively *internal* or not. Elsewhere he cites the language of Marshall,—"The intention is to be collected from the words."—(12. Wheaton, 332.) But neither does this support Mr. Spooner's second rule, for it is evident from all the other decisions of the Chief Justice, that where words are ambiguous, and admit of a construction more or less extended, the extent of the power is to be fixed by considering the general objects of the Constitution, the practice under it, and the historical evidence of the meaning. In all his great decisions he *constantly* refers to the history and institutions of the country. He does so in this very case from which these words are cited. Also at length in 4. Wheaton, 122; 6. Wheaton, 264; 9. Wheaton, 1; 12. Wheaton, 419. In 9. Wheaton, 1. he says:

"We know of no rule for construing the extent of such powers, other than the language of the instrument which confers them, taken in connection with the purposes for which they were conferred."

Let the reader refer, on this point, to the authorities cited in our second article, especially to that from 3. Howard, 24. In the whole course of the Supreme Court decisions we know of no such rule as this second one of Mr. Spooner's. In the whole of Judge Story's chapter on rules of interpretation, (Comm. Bk. III. c. V.) where he has grouped together all the decisions of the Supreme Court on this point, there is no allusion to any such principle. On the contrary, Story lays it down that "a power granted in general terms, is to be *coextensive* with the terms unless some clear restriction on it is deducible from the context." "Arguments from impolicy or inconvenience ought to have no weight; they are an unsafe guide; men differ, and times differ," &c. &c. And again; "The *causes* which led to the enactment of a law are often the best exponents of its words."—Comm. 1. 384, 407, 410. That the same rule prevails in England is shown by our previous extracts. In 8. Bingh. 181. also, Chief Justice Tindal said:

"If the words of an instrument be ambiguous, the Court will call in aid the *acts done* under it, as a clue to the intention of the parties."—See Dwarris, 696. 1. Kent, 462.

As we have remarked before reference to the institutions of the country and its history is one of the means the Courts use to determine, with *irresistible clearness*, the meaning of statutes.

Any other principle would lead to innumerable absurdities. We will adduce one or two:

The Constitution makes every "natural born citizen" eligible to the office of President. Now, women are citizens. Are they eligible? Here is a case precisely within Mr. Spooner's rules; the words are susceptible of a meaning consistent with natural justice; in which case he says, "that meaning, *and only that* meaning, is to be adopted."

Rutherforth (Natural Law, a work of high authority,) admits that antecedent to some *especial* "compact" women have the same "natural right" as men to act, vote, &c. as members of civil society.—p. 288. We know, also, that taxation and representation, on American theory, ought to go together—and women are taxed; this forms another reason for allowing them a participation in the honours and authority of office. Plainly, then, according to Mr. Spooner's rules, women are eligible to the Presidency. But it is just as plain that this is not law, nor the meaning of the Constituion; and that the Supreme Court would be justified in referring to the history and customs of the country and of the race and class of nations to which we belong in so construing this clause.

Mr. Spooner has foreseen this absurd consequence of his rules, and unwilling to follow them to their natural result, has endeavoured to guard against it, by pointing out that the Constitution, in speaking of the President, always uses the masculine gender. But this argument proves too much. It would shut women out of the protection of almost all constitutional provisions. For instance, "no person shall be compelled to be a witness against HIMSELF, nor be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law;" the accused shall enjoy the right to be confronted with the witnesses against HIM, "to have counsel for HIS defence." "A person charged with crime, shall be delivered up on demand of the State from which HE fled." Here and elsewhere the masculine gender only is used, but are women not included? It is a principle of law too well known for Mr. Spooner to have overlooked it, that in statutes the masculine gender includes both sexes. See Coke, 2. Inst. 45. Chitty's Contracts. Dwarris 713.

If, instead of legal rules, we refer only to general and popular usage the same is true. "HE that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and HE that believeth not shall be damned," has always been *supposed* to apply as much to women as to men.

In this case, therefore, if we construe the clause according to Mr. Spooner's rules, women are constitutionally eligible to the Presidency; nothing but "extraneous and historical evidence" shields us from this result. As Mr. Spooner does not allow of this when it will fix upon a clause any meaning contrary to "natural right," he is bound so to construe this provision, or to give up his rules, and more especially his second one.

So Congress has the power to "define and *punish* piracy."

Suppose the Anti-Capital Punishment party should increase, and insist that "to punish" may mean to imprison, does not necessarily refer to CAPITAL punishment—that this last is "inconsistent with natural right"—hence, "as an innocent meaning *and no other* must, if possible, be affixed to the Constitution," the Supreme Court are bound to decide that the Constitution does not give Congress power to punish pirates with death. This would be legitimate on Mr. Spooner's rule, but would it not be absurd? Ought not that Court to inquire what were the ideas and laws of 1789 on the subject, and if "on this extraneous and historical evidence" they found that capital punishment was not then deemed wrong, ought they not to consider this "as irresistible clearness of expression," and to hold the construction innocent and admissible? The same may be said of Slavery.

Again; "where words are susceptible of two meanings, one consistent and the other inconsistent *with justice and natural right*," &c.

Here the question arises, who is to decide whether a construction is or is not consistent with natural right? By what test are Courts to determine what is right and wrong? Mr. Spooner leaves it to be supposed that wherever a thing is generally considered wrong, there the Court will act on this principle. The use of an ambiguous word is here again the source of his mistake. It is true, as he says, that Courts will always give "an *innocent* meaning to words where they will bear it," but the test by which they try the guilt and innocence of a meaning is not general opinion or their own conscientious convictions; but by comparing it with *the general system and spirit of the law*. They will always "strain hard," as they phrase it, to give a *legally* innocent meaning to words, nothing more. But in doing so, they never will go counter to the general spirit and system of national law. We will offer some authorities on this point, referring, also, to the argument of our first article, since a Judge might almost as well take counsel of his individual opinions and overrule laws, as on the same account evade them under pretence of construction.

And first, Marshall, in the very sentence cited, refers to cases where "fundamental principles are overthrown where *the general system of law* is departed from," &c. clearly showing that he referred to violations of legal principles, not of moral ones.

This is the form in which the whole Bench of Massachusetts, with PARSONS at their head, lay down the principle:

"The natural import of the words of any Legislative act, according to the common use of them, when applied to the subject matter of the act, is to be considered as expressing the intention of the Legislature, unless the intention so resulting from the ordinary import of the words, be repugnant to sound and *acknowledged principles of national policy.*"—7 Mass. 529.

In the Girard case, whose exclusion of ministers from his college, was objected to as void, because contrary to religion—the Court say:

"We do not claim the right and we are not at liberty to look at general considerations of supposed public interests and policy beyond those which the Constitution, laws, and judicial decisions make known.—2. Howard, 197.

Lord Coke has undertaken to define *discretion* several times, and his idea of what sort of discretion Courts may exercise in these matters, is shown by his definitions. *Discretio est discernere per legem quid sit justum. (Discretion is the science of determining, according to law what is just.*—2. Inst. 298. Again; Reports 10, 140, "Discretion is well described as *scire per legem quid sit justum.*" (To find out *by law* what is just.)—10 Rep. 140.

So Sir J. Jekyl:

"Equity is said to be "*secundum discretionem boni viri*, (according to the discretion of a good man) Yet when it is asked, *Vir bonus est quis?* (who is a good man?) the answer is, *qui consulta patrum, qui leges jura que servat*, (the one who adheres to the opinions of the fathers, to *laws* and to *precedents.*)—2 P. Wms. 753.

We may illustrate the proper meaning of Mr. Spooner's rule by the construction put by the Courts upon one exactly parallel to it in relation to customs and usages. It is a well settled doctrine that "bad (wicked) customs are not law," that rules are to be disregarded if absurd or unjust.—See Blackstone and Coke. But what is meant by "wicked customs?"

It was long the *custom and rule* in England that acts of Parliament passed the *last* day of the session, had the same efficacy as if passed the *first* day of the session. Hence if, during the session, a man did an act legal at the time, he was still liable to suffer any punishment, even death, *afterwards* prescribed by the statute. On this principle, acknowledged to be absurd and unjust, one man would have been executed, for an act which was not murder when he did it, unless the King had pardoned him.—1. Lev. 91. Still this custom so far conformed to *legal principles*, that it remained in force three centuries, and no authority but that of the whole Parliament could repeal it.—See note to Blackstone, 1, 70. Here we see that the Courts by *wicked* customs do not mean morally wicked, but such as violate the general system of the law.

"Customs, says Blackstone, must be reasonable." "Which is not always, says Coke, to be understood of every unlearned man's reason, but of *artificial and legal* reason, warranted by authority of law.—Blackstone Comm., 1. 70. See other instances 3. 430. Story Equity 1, S. 15.

"Slavery, says Lord Stowell, one of the first Judges of the age, never was in Antigua the creature of law, but of that custom which operates with the force of law, and when it is cried out that '*malus usus abolendus est*, (bad customs are to be abolished,) it is *first to be proved* that even in the consideration of England the use (custom) of Slavery is considered as a *malus usus*, (bad custom) in the colonies."—2. Hagg. Adm. 94.

In the face of this rule that "bad customs are not binding and not law"—the system of villeinage, (*white* Slavery under which men and women were bought and sold, like cattle: see Stephens, Blackstone, Coke,) grew up from custom alone, was held legal for centuries, and died out only by disuse; without the enactment of a law in regard to it from the beginning to the end of its existence; clearly showing that the Courts in construing the word *bad*, in this connection, will have respect to the usages and laws of the land in which they are sitting.

Dwarris also in discussing the question, whether laws against *reason* are void, says:

"We must distinguish between right and power, between moral fitness and political authority. It must not be entertained as a question of *ethics*, but of the bounds and limits of *legislative power.*"—p. 645.

And Coke, even when he went so far as to think that bad law might be disregarded, tells the Judges that "they are not to be guided by the crooked cord of discretion, but by the golden metwand of the *law.*"

It is a general principle that no Court will give effect to the law of another nation, if that law be inconsistent with sound morals.—See Story Conflict of Laws.

But who shall decide what "sound morals" are?

The Court of King's Bench, in London, perhaps the first Court in the world, awarded to a Spaniard damages against an Englishman who had taken possession on the high seas, wrongfully, of certain slaves belonging to the Spaniard, on the ground that Slavery, though *contrary to justice*, was not forbidden by the law of nations or the law of Spain.

Contracts founded on *immoral* considerations are void. But Chief Justice Shaw stated, in the Med case, that a contract for the sale of a slave made in New Orleans, where Slavery is lawful, would be enforced in Massachusetts.

These instances show that Courts will look to the general spirit of the national laws, to discover whether a rule or provision be immoral or inconsistent with right, and will find out "by the law," as Coke says, "what is justice."

The language of Lord Stowell in regard to the Slave-Trade proceeds on the same principle:

"I must remember that in discussing this question, I must consider it not according to any *private moral apprehensions* of my own, (if I entertain them ever so sincerely,) but as *the law* considers it. * * An act must be *legally criminal*, because neither this Court or any other can carry its private apprehensions, independent of law, into its public judgments, on the quality of actions. It must conform to the judgment of the law upon that subject, and acting as a Court, in the administration of law, it cannot attribute criminality to an act where the *law imputes none* It must look to the *legal* standard of morality on a question of this nature.

And that standard must be found in the law of nations, as fixed and evidenced by general, ancient, and admitted practice, by treaties, and by the general tenor of the laws and ordinances and formal transactions of civilized States."—2. Dodson Adm. 247.

Marshall quotes and endorses this in 10. Wheaton 66, cited in our first article.

The language of our Supreme Court, whenever the justice of Indian land titles has come before them, will show the same principle.

In 8. Wheaton, 543. Chief Justice Marshall:

"We will not enter into the controversy whether agriculturists, merchants, and manufacturers have a right, *on abstract principles*, to expel hunters. Conquest gives a title, which the courts or the conqueror cannot deny, whatever the *private and speculative opinions of individuals* may be respecting the *original justice* of the claim. However extravagant the pretension of converting the discovery of a country into conquest may appear, if the principle has been asserted in the first instance and afterwards sustained; if a country has been acquired and held under it; if *the property of the great mass of the community originates in it*; it becomes the law of the land and cannot be questioned. * * However, the restriction may be *opposed to natural right*, if it is indispensable, it may, perhaps, be supported by reason and *certainly* cannot be *rejected* by Courts of justice."

In 4. Howard, 572, the Supreme Court say of the same point, Indian titles:

"It would be useless, at this day, to inquire whether the principle thus adopted is *just or not*.

"If it were an open question, it would be one for the law making department of the Government, and not for the judicial. It is our duty to execute the law as we find it, and we think it too firmly and clearly established to admit of dispute."

If, therefore, Mr. Spooner shall urge the Supreme Court to reject the plain meaning of any clause of the Constitution because that meaning sanctions an unjust system, that Court will naturally ask him whether the *general system of American law*, at the time the Constitution was made, looked upon that system as unjust and illegal? We say, at the *time* the Constitution was made—for contracts are to be held void or valid according as they are illegal *at the time* they are made.—See Comyns Con. 1. 31—see Spooner's p. 124. *On this principle* will not the Courts consistently decide that a pro-slavery meaning of the National Constitution cannot be held immoral or inadmissible, since twelve of the thirteen States which made it, held slaves at that time, and one-half of the nation still continues so to do? Or take the principle as Judge Marshall himself has laid it down, 4. Wheaton, 122:

"If in any case, the plain meaning of a provision is to be disregarded, because we believe the framers of the instrument *could* not intend what they say, it must be one in which the absurdity and injustice of applying the provision to the case, would be *so monstrous* that *all mankind* would, *without hesitation*, unite in rejecting it."

This is the *explanation which the Supreme Court give of their own language and meaning.* And could they, sitting at the capital of slaveholding States, under a Constitution *practically* pro-slavery ever since its existence, making a part of that Christendom, more than half of which now holds slaves, and the international law of which they have so often decided does not hold the Slave-Trade to be a crime, could they, with either truth or decency, affirm that the existence of a pro-slavery clause in that Constitution would be so "monstrous an absurdity and injustice that all mankind would, without hesitation, unite in condemning it"? This they must do before Mr. Spooner's maxim will apply to the subject of *Slavery*.

We conclude, then, 1st. that in deciding whether a possible meaning of any clause be immoral or not, Courts will have regard to the general system of National Law under which they sit.

2d. That Slavery neither can be, nor has been, by the law of nations, or our own laws held criminal, however, the *law of nature* may view it.

Having settled, then, the real meaning of these rules, let us pass to the other clauses of the Constitution, alluded to by Mr. Spooner. We shall dispose of them as briefly as possible:

"The migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each person."—(Art. I, Sec. 9.)

On this clause Mr. Spooner remarks that "importation" is sometimes used in reference to the voluntary arrival of foreigners, and has no necessary reference to slaves. Granted; still its *ordinary* and *common* use is to describe the bringing into a country, of articles of merchandise and for sale. Mr. Spooner says, p. 83, that *migration* means *going out* from a country, and hence argues that importation is used as its opposite, and refers simply to persons *coming in*. This construction is unsound; because the dictionary tells us that migration means merely "change of place." Emigration is used when we speak of going out of a country. Beside, it is the migration or importation of such as the State will ADMIT. We admit people *in*, never *out* of a country. Both words, therefore, refer to persons arriving; and they either relate, as Marshall says, (9. Wheaton, 1.) migration to voluntary arrivals, and importation to involuntary,—which would settle it that nothing else but the Slave-Trade could be referred to,—or migration means motion on land, and importation, arrivals by sea.

Mr. Spooner claims that this clause must refer to the arrival of foreigners only, and have no reference to slaves, because that is the only *innocent* meaning which can be given to it.

We reply, 1st. If it refers to the arrival of foreigners merely, what is the reason of the provision? Why was Congress allowed to tax them *until* 1808, and *no longer?* And after that date allowed to *prohibit their arrival altogether?* Such an arrangement seems entirely unintelligible; and it is indispensable to *make sense* of an instrument. Any construction which makes nonsense is to be rejected; see Dwarris, Blackstone, Marshall.

Again; does Mr. Spooner really maintain that this clause, so harmless in appearance, gives to Congress the monstrous power of prohibiting forever any foreigner from landing on our soil? and, (on his meaning of "migration,") of prohibiting every citizen from ever leaving it!!! Such a power some might think more inconsistent "with natural right" than the one he is striving to avoid. It can be only vindicated on the score of being *absolutely necessary*; and if absolutely necessary now, how were we safe in forbidding it to Congress for twenty years, till 1808 had arrived? If necessary now, why not then?

These considerations are sufficient to show that the meaning Mr. Spooner placed upon this clause cannot be the true one. If, on the contrary, we take it as it has usually been taken, to refer to the Slave-Trade it becomes consistent and intelligible, and does not confer upon Congress such a fearful power as that of, at any time, forbidding natives to leave and foreigners to land in, the country. Beside, this meaning is *legally* innocent, as we have above explained the meaning of the word, that is, taken in connection with our national laws and institutions. For instance, not only the State slave laws, (which we shall by and by prove constitutional and valid,) but our slave basis of representation, and our Ordinance of 1787, expressly guaranteeing, in so many words, the surrender of fugitive *slaves*, &c. &c. as well the constitutional provision on that point to which we now pass

"No person, held to service or labour in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labour; but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labour may be due."—Art. iv, Sec. 2.

Mr. Spooner's argument on this clause is the following:—(p. 68. &c.)

"'Held to service or labour' is no legal description of Slavery. Slavery has no necessary reference to 'service or labour;' it is property in man."

2d. "'Under the laws thereof.' There were no constitutional or valid laws in the States, relating to Slavery, at the time the Constitution was adopted."

3d. "The clause must be construed, if possible, as sanctioning nothing contrary to natural right.' It may refer to apprentices, &c. hence, not being "expressed with irresistible clearness,' it is not necessary to apply it to slaves, and being not necessary, it is not allowable to do so.

This is his argument, let us look at it. In the first place, we deny that his rules have any place here, since the legislative intention of referring to slaves is "expressed with that irresistible clearness," which the Court require. For it is a fundamental rule of interpretation, that all statutes relating to one subject are to be taken together, and any phrase in one is to be explained by referring to the use of the same phrase in the others.

Lord Mansfield says: (1. Burr, 447.)

"Where there are different statutes *in pari materia* (on the same subject) though made at different times, or even expired, and not referring to each other, they shall be taken and construed together, *as one system*, and explanatory of each other."

This rule has been recognized and acted on by every Court which exists in this country or England. See the Digests.

Now in 1787, the same year that the Constitution was drafted, Congress passed the Northwestern Ordinance, which says;

"There shall be neither Slavery nor involuntary servitude, in said territory &c.; Provided always that any person, escaping into the same, from WHOM LABOUR AND SERVICE IS LAWFULLY CLAIMED, in any one of the original States, such fugitive may be lawfully reclaimed, and conveyed to the person *claiming* HIS OR HER LABOUR OR SERVICE, as aforesaid."

This refers to Slavery, *for it says so.* It refers to *American* Slavery, for it was that which it proposed to exclude from this Northwest Territory. But when it provides for the surrender of fugitive slaves, it describes them as "PERSONS from whom LABOUR AND SERVICE IS LAWFULLY CLAIMED."

Now in that same year, 1787, the Constitution was drafted; we might expect a similar provision, and we find that in providing for the surrender of certain persons it describes them as "persons held to *service or labour* under the *laws*," to be delivered up on *claim*, &c.

The descriptions are exactly alike and must refer to the same case. Any Court would hold, and be justified in holding, under Mansfield's rule, that the meaning, to wit, the surrender of fugitive slaves, was "expressed with irresistible clearness."

We might stop here, as having made out our case, but we are willing to meet Mr. Spooner on his own ground.

The Supreme Court and the nation at large, interpret this clause to refer to slaves and to mean that no State shall shelter, but shall allow them to be taken by the national Government, from its limits back to slavery.

Mr. Spooner thinks this "contrary to natural right;" so do we. But is the world agreed on this point? The Court must certainly refer to some standard. Is the world then agreed on this point? *In the absence of express legislation*, the English and French Courts, and our own, have held that a slave ought not to be returned to his prison-house. But the writers on Jurisprudence maintain that a law to return him, if made, is "no encroachment on the rights of the fugitive, for no stranger has any just claim to the protection of a foreign State against its will, and each State has a right to determine who may come to reside or seek shelter within its limits." Such was the opinion of Shaw, even in his noble judgment in the Med Case,—and of Best, the distinguished English Judge, in an equally famous case in the annals of Liberty, 2. B. & C. 468. Mr. Spooner himself has just told us that the *innocent* meaning of the Slave-Trade clause of the Constitution is not that which expressly gives Congress power, after a time, to destroy that trade, but a construction which secures to Congress the power, after 1808, of *prohibiting any* foreigner from landing on our soil! What is this but an endorsement by Mr. Spooner of the views of Judges Shaw and Best, and the writers generally, that every State may *justly* determine for herself who shall seek shelter within her limits? It is not then so very evident that the verdict of the world in general, would consider a clause refusing slaves a shelter, as contrary to natural right. To what standard then shall the Courts have recourse? To that of our national system of law? That has generally been considered to sanction Slavery, and before we close we shall see if it does not actually do so. Its Ordinance of 1787, expressly orders the surrender of slaves. If it does, of course, judged by that test, the Court could not pronounce such a construction "bad" in a legal sense.

In reply to Mr. Spooner's third point, then, we say, let him show by the *general assent* of the world that the refusal of a sovereign State to shelter slaves is contrary to natural right. The Abolitionists think so. I wish they were a majority—unfortunately they are not—and the verdict of the world is against them.

Certainly the case is not one where, in the language of Chief Justice Marshall, "the *absurdity and injustice is so monstrous* that all the world would, *without hesitation*, unite in rejecting it"; and such it must be before the Court will feel justified in disregarding the plain meaning of a clause.

Again; to justify him in calling upon our Courts to esteem such a construction bad, he must show it to be "bad," *i. e* contrary to the general system of our law. They cannot "attribute criminality where the law imputes none." Now the Ordinance of 1787, *still in force*, establishes just this arrangement for the Northwest Territory. The Courts of such nation would no more feel entitled in such circumstances, to call it *bad*, then a Court in a slave State would refuse to enforce a slave contract under the plea that it was immoral.

The reader will observe that the question is not now what he or we think wrong, but what is so generally regarded as wrong and monstrous by all mankind, or by the law that the Courts may ground their decisions on such opinion.

Mr. Spooner's other point is that:

"Held to service or labour" is no legal description of Slavery. Slavery has no necessary reference to 'service or labour;' it is property in man."

This is originally T. D. Weld's argument. Anything from him deserves the most respectful attention.

"*The terms of the Constitution, says Marshall, must be understood in that sense in which they were universally received in this country, when the Constitution was framed.*" 4. Cranch, 470.

To this well settled and reasonable principle Mr. Spooner assents.—p. 124:

"The only question is, what was the meaning of the Constitution, as a legal instrument, when it was *first drawn* up and presented *to the people* and before it was adopted by them?"

This, too, is the rule by which we interpret Shakspeare, or any writer—turning to the dictionaries *of his period* to find the meaning of the terms he uses.

Now, how was Slavery defined in 1788, and previous to, and about that period? We have seen how the nation itself described a slave in the Ordinance of 1787:

"*A person* from whom *labour and service* is *lawfully claimed.*"

"No negro child shall be *held in servitude*, &c. notwithstanding the parent of such child was *held in servitude* at the time of its birth," &c.—Connecticut Emancipation Act. 1784.

"Slavery is an *obligation to labour* for the benefit of a master, without the contract or consent of the *servant.*"—Paley, 1785.

Obligation comes from the Latin word to *bind* or *hold.*

Harrarve, in his defence of Somersett before Lord Mansfield, 1772, gives us a definition of Slavery, which begins thus:

"Slavery imports an *obligation* of perpetual *service.*"

Grotius's definition is this:

"Slavery is an *obligation* to *serve* another for life, in consideration of being supplied with the bare necessaries of life."

Rutherforth, about 1770, defines it:

"An *obligation* to be directed in all one's actions."

Johnson's Dictionary, 1755:

"Slave, one mancipated (bound) to a master."

Bailey's Dictionary, the best of his day, edition of 1782:

"Slave, a perpetual *servant*; a person in the absolute power of a master."

Ash's Dictionary, 1775:

"Slave, one sold to a master, *one sold to labour.*"

The Constitution of Vermont, *about* the same period, 1793, provides that:

"No male person ought to be *holden by law to serve* any person as a servant, *slave*, or apprentice."

Mr. Spooner allows, p. 73, that "*bound* to service" and "*held* to service" are the same thing. Now, *bondman* (*boundman*) is the old and usual English word for slave and *bondage* for Slavery. It is so used in the Bible. We get *slave* from the Russian and kindred languages—*villein* from the French, and *servant* from the Latin *servus*, a slave. Bondage and bondman are Saxon.

Again, as to "*service*" having no relation to Slavery; *service, servant,* and *servitude*, are all derived from the Latin word for *slave*, SERVUS; and they have been always used to designate Slavery. Joseph, who was bought by three persons and paid for, was call *a servant* so of others.

So much for Mr. Spooner's idea that in 1788, "service and labour" did not enter into the idea of Slavery.

Such, then, were the common, popular, philosophical, and legal descriptions of Slavery in 1788. I know that the law sometimes uses the technical terms "chattel personal," to describe a slave. But the makers of the Constitution were not *obliged* to use *technical terms*. In framing a popular instrument for the use of the whole people, they naturally would avoid, and always have avoided, doing so where they could, and used instead the terms common in the Dictionaries and writers of the day. The above quotations show that in 1788, "service and labour" were thought to make a part of Slavery, and that slaves were *usually*, if not *always*, described as *persons held, bound, and sold to service or labour.* Beside, the provision was meant to cover many States and only the most universal definition would suffice. It would not do to describe them as "chattels personal;" that might include South Carolina, but Kentucky, and now Louisiana consider them *real estate*; in such case, the term would not be broad enough. Again, had they been called, generally, property such a term would hardly have included the thousands in Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Pennsylvania, then held in a modified Slavery created by recent laws.

That the clause does not relate to obligations growing out of *contract* is evident from this, that elsewhere (Art. I. Sec. 10) the States are forbid to interfere with or annul contracts. To interpret this clause as relating to contracts would make it mere repetition and superfluous.

Judged, then, by the usage of 1788, the term "held to service and labour" does aptly describe the condition of a slave, and is the phraseology usually employed for that purpose. This is our answer to Mr. Spooner on this point.

Lastly, "under the laws thereof." Mr. Spooner says this implies constitutional laws. He is right. We shall discuss this under our last division.—W. P.

Corrections.

In our last article—"It is ludicrous to say of the legislation of thirteen States, all of which had held slaves till within seven years, and twelve of which still *hold* them," should read, "still *held* them,"—meaning in 1787—as all then held slaves but Massachusetts.

Again: "There never was a State which took account of aliens," &c. should read "took any special account," &c.—W. P.

The Rev. Dr. Dewey.

The Christian Register of Boston, copies a short article from this paper, on Dr. Dewey, and adds:

We copy the above paragraph from the Anti-Slavery Standard, and have seen words to the same effect in several other papers. Cannot our friends, the leading Abolitionists, after having suffered so much from the misrepresentations of those opposed to them, learn not to receive on slight evidence, serious charges against their fellow-men? We took no notice of the paragraph in the Chronotype, because we doubted its truth. Happening, a few days since, to fall in with one whom the Liberator, two weeks since, characterized as "a high-minded man and no demagogue," and knowing that he was one of Dr. Dewey's hearers, we asked him about this sermon. He replied, that nothing could be more unjust than the impression given by the reports. Dr. Dewey, in discoursing upon Christianity, spoke of it as dealing with great central principles, and not branching out into particulars. "We have in it, for instance," he said, "no Abolitionism or teetotalism, or any other *ism*, but the great principles which govern and carry forward every great moral movement."

This gentleman, to whom we refer, who is a strong Anti-Slavery man, said moreover, that Dr. Dewey's preaching this winter, in respect to our great national sins, had been distinguished by a boldness, at times, quite startling, and people wondered how he could say such things without giving more offence.

Will the Anti-Slavery Standard, the Liberator, and the Christian World, be so good as to give this explanation?

We most cheerfully give the explanation of the Christian Register in its own words, and wish as sincerely that we could add it is entirely satisfactory. But we cannot see that the report

would, however, we should suppose, be more gratifying to his friends, if the proof on that point were palpable, and the evidence, that he had preached against what little effort at reform there is in the country, were vague and general. "Our national sins" have been a popular subject for declamation at Washington during the last session of Congress, and the preacher who should have confined himself to the individual sins of his people, out of which the national sin grows, would have well fulfilled his mission. But as Dr. Dewey chose to deal only in generalities, or descended to particulars only to denounce the unpopular opposers of popular wrong, it is not, we think, to be wondered at that he gave no offence.

Christianity and Reform.

The connection of Christianity with what are commonly called the reforms of the day is a most intimate and vital one. It is not a connection of separate or differing things, but of things which cannot be separated without fatally injuring both. True Christianity goes hand in hand with all honest and faithful labours to abolish Slavery, to root out intemperance, to extinguish the flames of war, and to remove any and all of the social inequalities and wrongs which, by law or custom, are inflicted on man. The religion which does these things, and labours for them, is the true Gospel, the really "glad tidings" to the poor, the prisoner, the slave, the outcast; and the religion which does *not* these is another Gospel, not Christ's, for he came to bring good tidings to the suffering and lowly. Christianity, therefore, has a direct and necessary connection with all the great moral questions of the day. It *ceases to be Christianity* the moment it forsakes them. Who can persuade himself that Christ will acknowledge, as his, a Church which, seeing the man fallen among thieves,—wounded, bleeding, half dead,—passes by on the other side? If not such an one, how, then, will he acknowledge, as his, a Church which *apologizes* for the wrong done to that bleeding and helpless man? nay, which goes still farther, joins partnership with the robbers and murderers, and welcomes them as worthy religious companions and brethren? No! to maintain that he will, is to pronounce him a deceiver, and to make his religion an offence and an object of scorn to every honest mind. Christ points us to the suffering man, to the injured and wronged man, to the neglected, the despised, the poor, as in a peculiar sense our brethren. Pointing to them he bids us go, and be to all such in the stead of the good Samaritan. Words of pity, emotions of sorrow, tears of sympathy, are well, but are not enough. Christ said, "Go, and do ye likewise." *Go* and *do*. Wait not till the shivering, wretched outcast comes to your door. Make your voice reach him even now in his distant and sorrowful abode; make it reach the ear of his oppressor, and of every one who connives at the oppressor's deed; in every way you can, in word and deed, be as a brother to him; and steadfastly "remember him in his bonds, even as though you were bound with him."

Whenever Christianity, as administered amongst us, ceases to be the advocate of the slave, and the faithful reprover of his oppressor, that instant it ceases to be Christianity. Its claims as such should never be allowed. We should take care how we do so great a wrong to Christ as to allow any such claims. We should manifest our regard for Christianity, by withholding all regard from such a Church. We should attest our discipleship of Christ, in part, by exposing the hypocrisy of these usurpers of his name, and by endeavours to rescue the victims of their treachery. We should make our test of Christian character, and our condition of Christian fellowship, identical with his; remembering that, inasmuch as we do not the work of love and pity to the least and humblest of his brethren, we do it not to him.—S. M.

The Influence of Women.

Among the various dangers to which the Anti-Slavery cause has, both from within and without, been menaced, woman has always been among the foremost to discern and to avert the danger which threatened, from the Clerical Appeal down to Liberty party; and to her we are indebted for many of the most clear and most vigorous exposures of pretended Anti-Slavery in its false guises. She has always been among the foremost to array herself on the unpopular side, when she could thus more effectually serve the cause which she had at heart. When the American Society saw that the time had come for repudiating all allegiance to a Government, into whose very essence Slavery had been incorporated, from the first, by a wicked compromise on the part of those who ought to have been the brave defenders of freedom, and when they saw that appeal for assistance to a most corrupt and faithless Church was vain, woman was ready to take her place in the small, but hopeful band who were willing, for the slave's sake, to be counted as traitors to their country, and as infidels in the sight of God. She has always been ready to sacrifice a supposed present good for the attainment of one more distant, yet greater; and upon her, threats and flattery have been alike without effect.

And what have been the results of thus facing a narrow and bigoted prejudice which would degrade one-half of the human family to an artificially subordinate position in the great work of reform—which would deprive woman of that great inducement to the devotion of her talents and means in the support of the cause, the consciousness that the largest field is open to her for the exercise of her influence, and that she may apply all her energies with the full conviction that her efforts for the overthrow of Slavery will have their legitimate effect? Have we witnessed, as it was predicted by false and timid friends we should, any decrease in the interest which our movement inspires in the public mind? Have our labours excited less attention and reflection? Have our papers been read with less interest? Have our treasuries, therefore, been more scantily supplied with the means for the farther dissemination of the truth? Where do we find that great vital action which keeps alive, in the hearts of the people the remembrance of the grievous wrongs of the slave? Is it not *felt* by all that this vital action is found within the limits of the American Anti-Slavery Society? The New Organization lies buried in the grave which it dug for itself when it assumed the proscriptive position which effectually sundered all ties that had enlisted woman in its support, and its successor, the Liberty party, is fast following it to the same final destination. Among the active supporters of the latter, how few women do we find of expansive minds, or souls which have been filled with profound tearfulness for the sufferings of the slave. Let us rejoice, then, in the glorious results which always attend devotion to principle rather than regard to expediency, resolved to turn aside for none of the temptations which may yet be presented to us, but to press right onward, over all obstacles, to our grand aim, the deliverance of the slave.—H. W. G.

Frederick Douglass.

The friends of Frederick Douglass in this country will be glad to learn that it is contemplated by his friends in Great Britain and Ireland, to raise a fund to be presented to him as a testimonial of their appreciation of his character and labours. We observe in the British Friend an advertisement signed by some of the most distinguished Abolitionists in London, Glasgow, and other places, asking for contributions. We most sincerely hope that this effort will be successful. Mr. Douglass has not, we presume, a single friend in this country who will not rejoice most heartily should he return home with a sum in his pocket which will secure to him and his family a comfortable and handsome support for the future. The noble generosity of the English people could not find a more worthy subject, and the act will be alike honourable to givers and receiver. Here, we venture to say, there will no disagreement among American Abolitionists, however much there may be on the question of his purchase. *That* question, we trust, may now be suffered to sink into silence. Enough has been said on both sides to set the matter in every light before the public, and its further discussion can be of no benefit. We cannot, in alluding once more to it, refrain from expressing our regret at the manner in which, on one or two occasions, the Liberator has met those who have not approved of the step taken by the English friends. It is, we are certain, entirely possible to entertain an honest belief that the purchase of Douglass was unwise, or even wrong; and many who do believe so—and we presume they are a large portion of the Abolitionists of this country—are nevertheless the faithful and diligent friends of the slave. There is, we think, no necessity of denying the sincerity and intelligence of those who may take either side of a question, on which there may be a legitimate difference of opinion; nor does it follow that those who may advocate one view of the subject necessarily belong to the class which is never aroused to activity, by the injustice of Slavery, or the atrocity of pro-slavery. Reflections of such a character could hardly fail to wound some of Mr. Garrison's best friends, and most earnest and devoted advocates of the slave's cause; though, of course, we are certain that the possibility of such a thing was not thought of by him.

☞ A few self-denying women got up a Fair at West Winfield, the proceeds of which they intended to devote to the promotion of the Anti-Slavery cause. Perhaps their notions of the best means to hasten the abolition of Slavery are wrong: but they are, at least, conscientious. If all the people would labour as ardently, and with as much self-forgetfulness, the infernal system would soon come to an end. Thus should we suppose one, who made any claim to being an Abolitionist, would reason. Hear now the Albany Patriot, a Liberty party paper, on the accident at the West Winfield Fair. The Express, Herald, or Courier and Enquirer, could not have done better:

The "Old Organizationists" held a Fair at Winfield, Herkimer county, last month. During the most interesting part of the performance, the floor of the hall in which they were met refused to bear its burden, and men, women, children and "fixins" landed in one promiscuous heap in a horse-shed below. Bitter complaints are made that the by-standers and loafers froze to the cash and whatever else was worth the trouble; so that the "$300 to $500" which was expected as the result of the effort, was not realized. Alas, poor Yorick!

☞ We are kindly permitted to make the following extract from a private letter dated, Bristol, February 15th, 1847. We are much gratified to hear, as we have no doubt all Mrs. Foster's friends will be, of an honour which may be paid to one who is as much deserving of it as any living woman:

"I must apologize for my omission in not thanking you for the engraving of Mrs. A. K. Foster. It was very acceptable indeed, and you will think I am making a good use of it, when I tell you I have lent it to Mrs. Howitt, to be copied for the new "Journal," *Howitts'*. I was glad to see Cassius M. Clay's face, but oh! what a moral blunderer he is! He *had* a course that might have satisfied the most ambitious; now history will not recognize him."

THE RAM'S HORN.—This paper has reached its twelfth number, and has lived long enough to enable the public to judge understandingly of its merits, and how far it is deserving of support. This judgment, we should suppose, must be in its favour. It is conducted with ability and independence, and should receive the unfaltering aid of the coloured people, especially of this city. There are enough of them to maintain handsomely a paper, conducted by one of their own number, and devoted mainly to their true interests. We should be glad to hear that some systematic effort was made to put the Ram's Horn on a permanent basis.

THE PRICE.—The Washington Correspondent of the Tribune says, that he understood from an *official source*, that if all the debts accruing so far from the war, including the regular expenses of the army, were liquidated, they would amount to ONE HUNDRED MILLIONS OF DOLLARS. The just way of paying this price for the extension of Slavery would be by a direct tax on property. We have no doubt that the Cottonocracy, in that case, would begin to understand that they have something to do with it. But the poor people will have to pay for it eventually by a tax on the necessaries of life.

An American army, with TAILOR at its head, we are confident, would never submit to treble its number; nay, would prefer to make of this Pass of Rinconada another Thermopylæ, and leave an equally proud epitaph for future admiration.

The above remark is made by one of the editors—we suppose he should be called the *classical editor*—of the Tribune. If we have not forgotten our schoolboy lore, Leonidas and his band were at Thermopylæ with quite another purpose than that which sent Gen. Taylor and his army of marauders to the Pass of Rinconada. History will write the epitaph of a modern Persian rather than a modern Greek on the page that records the invasion of Mexico. It is a pity that the good influence of the Tribune on the subject of this infamous war should be marred by such appeals to the brutal passion for glory and human blood.

DR. PATTON'S "HIGH SEAT."—In the article in last week's paper on this subject, we refrained from naming the persons who attended the ministrations of the Rev. Dr. Patton, in the favoured seat, at his "right hand," on Sunday of last week. As their names, however, have been given to the public in one of the daily papers our scruple is removed. They were the Rev. Ebenezer Davies and his wife. Mr. Davies is a Congregational clergyman, and has been for seven years a missionary of the London Missionary Society, to the emancipated slaves of New Amsterdam, county of Berbice, British Guiana. We trust he will make a report to his constituents on his return to England, on the "peculiar institution" of the American churches.

☞ The Rev. Theodore Sedgwick Wright, of the Frankfort street Church, of this city, died on Thursday last. A large concourse of coloured and white people attended his funeral on Monday morning.

☞ The Liberty party have made the following nominations for the Judges of the Court of Appeals:—Wm. Goodell, of Ontario; Alvan Stewart, of Oneida; Horace Dresser, of New-York; and Leonard Gibbs, of Washington.

From our Baltimore Correspondent.

BALTIMORE, 28th March, 1847.

The only thing worthy of note, out of the usual course of things, is the growing interest on the part of the clergy, in behalf of the soldiers who have, and are soon to embark for the war. The Rev. Dr. Roberts, for sometime past preached at Fort McHenry, every Sunday, and, it is said, he has been instrumental in doing much good to the soldiers stationed there. We are not informed in what way they have been benefited. We hear of none who have "beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning-hooks," and renounced the unholy business of war; and I am at a loss to know how they have been benefited by his preaching. If he has preached the truth to them, and they have received it, it must spoil them for soldiers. Christians can't be soldiers! But I think we shall be able to judge of the preaching by the fruits. As part of the soldiers were about to sail for the "seat of war," the Rev. Divine requested all his converts who——had determined to be Christians, and forever sheath their swords and "learn war no more," and renounce their present unholy avocation? No! but all who wanted BIBLES to take with them to Mexico, to make it known, and of the two hundred quartered there, sixty expressed a desire to have this Christian's chart. Accordingly, on last Tuesday, the Rev. Drs. Morris and Roberts proceeded to the Fort freighted with "God's truth," for distribution to the converts. The books were presented, as each man's name was called out, but before this "solemn ceremony" was completed, such an interest was awakened that the converts were multiplied by tens and twenties, until more than 150 received the "way of salvation," with "apparent gratitude," and marched off with the "precious volume" under one arm, and bearing the implements of death with the other.

Two more companies are expected in a few days at this Fort; and these Divine Doctors have come out in the daily papers with an appeal to Christians, (I wonder who they mean,) for more Bibles to furnish them with. What a debt of gratitude will be due these proclaimers of the everlasting Gospel; these teachers of the mild, gentle, and peace-instilling doctrines of the meek and lowly Jesus. We shall expect to hear a good report from this little Christian band of soldiers. Who doubts that their prayers will reach the "ear of the God of battles," and that they will "ride on conquering and to conquer;" and that truth and Christianity will be established where all now is error and superstition. What a harmonious system of religion we have got; how beautifully it chimes in to strengthen the noble spirit of patriotism, and give the soldier encouragement to fight manfully for HIS country, teaching him that the Christian soldier's grave is the very gate of heaven. How beautifully it comes to the aid of the Christian system of Slavery, teaching the servant to be obedient unto his master. Who but our God could adapt a volume of teachings, so admirably to our Christian nation, and so simple that the soldier though a fool need not err therein. This will be decidedly a glorious country, when this Christianity, which is being so generally diffused, shall have covered the continent.

Yours, for true Christianity,
N.

Notes on New Books.

The Prose Writers of America, with a Survey of the History, condition, and prospects of American Literature. By Rufus Wilmot Griswold. Illustrated with portraits from original pictures. Philadelphia. Carey & Hart. 1847.

Mr. Griswold is already very well known from his former publication of "the Poets of America," which has been unprecedentedly popular for a work of that class. The "Prose writer," we think, will be quite as widely circulated, for the people are always alive to hear something new about the authors, whose works have given them pleasure. The Prose writers of America are so numerous, that even a bare catalogue of their names would make a good sized library volume. But Mr. Griswold has included in his book only seventy names, some of whom are not very well known for anything, and some of them, as Calhoun and Webster, have never been known as writers at all, while others, as Bryant, Dana, Longfellow, Willis and Wilde, had been included in his book of Poets. It will occasion some surprise to find that he has included but five female names in his catalogue, when the reading public is inundated with such torrents of tepid water from the pens of ladies who exhaust their inventive powers in giving themselves a vegetable *nomme de plume* as *Betsy Buttercup, Laura Laurestina, or Harriet Hollyhock*. The female writers are Mrs. Child, Miss Sedgwick, Mrs. Kirkland, Miss Leslie and Miss Fuller. There could have been no harm in adding Hannah Adams to the list. But we must allow the builder of a Walhalla the privilege of selecting his own heroes to put into it, for, as every man is known by the company he keeps, so do the writers of history and biography reveal themselves in the personages whose lives they embellish. Mr. Griswold has omitted Cotton Mather, James Kent, and Theodore Parker from his collection of American Prose writers, and has included Cornelius Matthews, Joel T. Headley and Herman Hooker. He has put in H. T. Tuckerman and Theodore Fay, and left out John L. Stephens and J. G. Whittier.

The principle by which Mr. Griswold prefesses to have been guided in the composition of his book was a perfectly just one, and, indeed, had he not been guided by it, his book would have been a strange jumble of raw materials; it was to select only the names of writers who were authors, and not merely the compilers of books, such as biographers, sermon makers, reviewers, and that numerous class who manufacture books with the aid of scissors and paste. It was an extremely difficult task, and we are surprised that it was performed so well. It is no disparagement to Mr. Griswold to say that it might have been better done, although we know of no one who could have done it better. That his work is not more complete, appears to be the fault of his publishers, who left off nearly two hundred and fifty pages of matter which he had prepared, and wherein he doubtless included many names that we miss in looking over his catalogue. He begins with Jonathan Edwards, and ends in E. P. Whipple. Of the former he says: "The first man of the world, during the second quarter of the 18th century, was Jonathan Edwards, of Connecticut," and of the latter, that he "has exhibited remarkable powers, both discriminating and comprehensive in many critical essays, and gives promise of occupying a higher rank than has been attained by any other American in this department."

Midway the volume, we find the name of Josiah Quincy, late the President of Harvard University. As a favourable specimen of the biographies, we select Mr. Griswold's brief record of the life and writings of this venerable patriot, who will be more justly appreciated at some future time when political fanaticism shall not blind men's eyes to the perception of moral truths. It should never be forgotten that Josiah Quincy had the boldness to declare, on the floor of Congress, that the extension of slave territory would, and should dissolve the union of the States. Mr. Griswold says, "Since then the tree has become *dry*, yet the Union is not dissolved." But if the tree has become dry, it is just in the best condition to be felled. Mr. Quincy probably did not mean that the union would be dissolved the next day; but that the admission of a certain principle into the government of the country must lead to that event, and it is not altogether improbable that he will live to see his prophecy fulfilled.

"Josiah Quincy, the third of these names, is of the fifth generation from Edmund Quincy, who came from England with the Rev. John Cotton, in 1633, and is the son of Josiah Quincy, the associate of Otis and Warren, whose premature death was one of the severest losses sustained by the country in the beginning of the Revolution. "May the spirit of liberty rest upon him," the dying patriot wrote in his will, and left him as a specific legacy, the works of Tacitus and Cato, Sydney, Bacon and Locke. He was graduated at Harvard University in 1780, and in 1804 commenced his public life as a member of the Massachusetts Senate. In the same year he was elected to the National House of Representatives, in which he continued until March, 1813, when he declined further service in that body. He, however, accepted a seat in the Legislature of the State, and was a Senator from 1813 to 1820, and from the last year, to 1822, a member of the lower House, of which he was twice chosen Speaker. In 1822, he became Judge of the Municipal Court of Boston, and was mayor of that city from 1823 to 1828, when he declined being again a candidate for the office. From 1829 to 1845, he was president of Harvard University, and was succeeded, upon his resignation, in the last year, by Edward Everett. Mr. Quincy is an "old federalist," a term which is commonly given as a reproach, and received, where it is merited, as an honour.

The period in which he was in Congress, was one of extraordinary interest, when party spirit ran high, and decision, boldness, and energy were indispensable qualities for politicians of either side. He was equal to the emergency, and sustained himself, on all occasions, with manly independence, sound argument, and fervent declamation. One of his most effective speeches was made in the House of Representatives in November, 1808, on a resolution to resist the edicts of Great Britain and France; but this is less celebrated than his speech in 1811, on the bill for the admission of Louisiana. If this bill passes, he said, "the bonds of this Union are virtually dissolved; the States which compose it are free from their moral obligations, and it will be the right of all, and the duty of some to prepare definitely for a separation, *peaceably if we can, forcibly if we must.*" Before such an act, he thought the bands of the Constitution were no more than flax before the fire, or stubble before the whirlwind. The tree has since then become *dry*, yet the Union is not dissolved.

War, right or wrong, always commands the suffrages of the rabble, for to them, as surely as to carrion birds, it furnishes occupation and subsistence. Mr. Quincy rarely referred to himself, but in his speech on the army bill, in 1813, alluding to the charges of vulgar calumny by which the imaginations of most men are affected, he said "It is not for a man whose ancestors have been planted in this country for almost two centuries * * * * who is conscious of being rooted in the soil as deeply and as exclusively as the oak which shoots among its rocks * * * * to hesitate or swerve a hair's breadth from his country's true interests, because of the yelpings, the howlings, and the snarlings of that hungry pack which corrupt men keep directly or indirectly in pay, with the view of hunting down every man who dare develope their purposes; a pack composed of some native curs, but for the most part, of hounds and spaniels of very recent importation, whose backs are scarred with the lash, and whose necks are sore with the collars of their former masters." In and out of Congress, he was faithful to what he deemed the true interests of the people, and laboured zealously to bring men and measures to the bar of public opinion. Mr. Quincy has published between thirty and forty speeches, orations, addresses, and miscellaneous tracts; the life of Josiah Quincy, (his father,) the life of James Grahame, (the Historian,) and the History of Harvard University, in two large octavo volumes, which appeared in 1840."—S.

Great Events described by distinguished writers, collected and in part translated by Francis Lieber. New-York: Harper & Brothers, 1847.

This work was compiled upon a most excellent plan, by a scholar in every way qualified for the task he undertook. The events begin with the death of Socrates, and end with the siege of Saragossa. It is a brief record of what mankind have done to free themselves from the yoke of the oppressor, and the reading of such events must have a strengthening influence upon the spirits of the true hearted. We only wish that the author had made his work a little more complete, and included more of the great events of the present century. A glossary is affixed to the work which renders it of greater service to young readers.

The Pictorial History of England, No 20.—Harper & Brothers.

The beautiful manner in which this work is published, would alone insure it a very large circulation. The embellishments are not mere pictures, but are real illustrations, being mainly copied from authentic portraits, old tapestries, and coins, and medals. The present number includes one of the most interesting periods of British history, that of the martyr age of Protestantism. There is always an age of protest, and that which we are passing through now will loom up in future history, more conspicuously than the age of Cranmer, for the martyrs to the cause of human freedom are in no wise inferior to the martyrs in the cause of religious ceremonials. There are men now in dungeons, whose only crime was the desire to redeem their fellow-beings from Slavery, and the red-hot branding-iron has entered the flesh of men living amongst us, because they were suspected of an intention to teach the Word of God to the slave. There is another book of martyrs yet to be written.—B.

Knickerbocker for March.—This Magazine, with a cruelty of which we did not suppose the good-natured "pus-son" who edits, it capable, expresses its determination not to gratify the laudable ambition of this Journal to have its name enrolled upon the immortal pages of the Knickerbocker. The "vituperation, intemperate, and foul-mouthed denunciations" which he has heard always characterize a paper—of which, by the bye, he confesses he has never seen but one number—are his reasons for not stooping to recognize our existence. With Paul Pry, we are almost persuaded never to do another good-natured thing. Our own notice of the Knickerbocker was made at the request of a friend of both parties who knows very well the relative intelligence of the readers of each. We are rash enough to confess publicly our enjoyment at the self-complacency of the editor of the Knickerbocker. He abuses us of a fault of which he himself is most grossly guilty in describing it, and in accusing us of vanity—for which, if we possessed it in this case, we should deserve to be most roundly laughed at—displays a most overweening sense of his own self importance. Perhaps, however, we ought to acknowledge our error in venturing to hint that the abuse and ridicule of an unfortunate class of people was out of place in a periodical pretending to respectability. The editor of the Knickerbocker is of course better acquainted with the taste of his readers than we are, and judges wisely for his own interests, doubtless, when catering to a prejudice fast becoming as vulgar as it has always been brutal and inhuman.

Young American's Magazine of Self-Improvement. Edited and published by Geo. W. Light. 3 Cornhill, Boston.

This two monthly magazine, the second number of which is just issued, aims at awakening a more general interest in self-improvement, and to assist those who are already engaged in so necessary a work. Properly speaking, there is no other improvement worth the name, except self improvement, and Mr. Light will do a great work if he can convince the rising generation of this truth. There was never a great man yet, who was not a self-made one. Education never made a fool a wise man, nor the want of it a wise man a fool. As good a thing as teaching is, it is nothing without the will to learn. To give to all the means of learning is the best system of education for the people. The purpose of Mr. Light is, as we understand it, to give to the many the means of learning, and urge them to their use. His magazine is well calculated for this purpose. Among his contributors are some of the best minds in the country, and his selections are made with good judgment. The editor has commenced his work in the spirit of independence which is so necessary and so rare in those who profess to be the teachers of the people.

The Farmer's Library, and Monthly Journal of Agriculture.

We again call the attention of our readers, especially those in the country, to this work. It is the most valuable publication of its kind in this country, not only as an agricultural journal, but for its republication of standard works on the science of farming. The day has gone by when the book farmer was laughed at, and he who now expects to be successful as an agriculturist without availing himself of the knowledge which books offer, will find his mistake, in remaining a poor man, and a clumsy farmer. The Library and Journal leaves no subject unattended to which is of value to the farmer in his profession. It gives the most promising theories and the practical results of important experiments, and is in short, a complete book of the Farm, in-doors and out. Its plan moreover, is so wide a one that it embraces many topics of great importance to others besides farmers, and no intelligent man can fail to find it a most valuable and instructive work. Published by Greely & McElrath: Tribune Buildings.

To Correspondents.

A. H. R. of Newcastle-on-Tyne, may, if convenient forward the amount to Mr. R. Smith, 1, Guildhall Chambers, London.

W. P. All right—*only* you forgot to enclose it in your note. Please let us know by to-morrow if there will be nothing for the next paper.

L. S. The papers had been sent to Boston, as we supposed that to be his address. Such numbers as he needs have been duly forwarded to W.

A. B. M. Was not received early enough for this week's paper. It shall appear in the next.

This Week's Paper.

FOURTH PAGE.—*Poetry*: Ingoldsby's Last Poem; An Old Poem. *Miscellany*: Ragged Schools; Death of the Big Soldier; The Virginia Negro's Song; Choice Cherry Brandy; Gleanings from Foreign Papers.

FIRST PAGE.—*Pro-Slavery*: Rev. Mr. Kenyon—The Confederation. *Selections*: Negro Slavery—Mr. Haughton; Abolition of French Slavery in Turkey; Anti-Slavery League; A Hard Case; Straining at a Gnat; The Omitted Clause. *Communications*: Cazenovia Anti-Slavery Convention (concluded).

SECOND PAGE.—Mr. Shafter and the New-York Observer.

Married,

At Brooklyn, on Monday evening, JOHN N. MAFFIT, the celebrated Methodist preacher, to Miss FRANCES SMITH, step-daughter of Judge Pierce, of Brooklyn.

At Washington, on the 18th instant, WM. CAREY JONES, of New Orleans, to ELIZA PRESTON CARRINGTON BENTON, daughter of Col. Thomas H. Benton, of Missouri.

In Boston, March 23, Rev. OCTAVIUS BROOKS FROTHINGHAM, Pastor of the North Church, Salem, to CAROLINE ELIZABETH, daughter of Caleb Curtis, Esq.

Died,

On Second-day, 29th instant, ISAAC T. HOPPER GIBBONS, infant son of James S. and Abigail H. Gibbons, in the 6th year of his age.

At his residence in Ulster county on the 13th instant, GREEN MILLER, M. D. brother of Sylvanus Miller, Esq. of this city, in the 78th year of his age.

In Rome, February 18th, AMOS BINNEY, Esq. of Boston, aged 43 years.

In Jamaica, (Vermont) March 16th, Mrs. ELIZA, wife of Rev. Sumner Lincoln, and daughter of the late Prof. Nathan Smith, of New Haven, aged 45 years.

In this city, at the residence of his son, Benjamin F. Butler, on the 27th ultimo, Hon. MEDAD BUTLER, aged 81 years.

GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

Foreign.

Late from Mexico.

The war party are delighted with the intelligence from Mexico, received early in the week, that Gen. Taylor and his army have succeeded in butchering five thousand Mexicans, with a loss to themselves of only about one thousand one hundred men. The report is that the American General had retreated to Monterey, and sallied thence and given battle to Santa Anna, with the above result. Of conrse the Mexicans were defeated, as it would be declared they were, if they were to follow Taylor to Washington. The whole story is merely a rumour, with no other authority than the word of the Captain of a schooner, which has arrived at New Orleans from Brazos. It is probably only another version of the news we gave last week.

Late from Haiti.

By an arrival at New Orleans, we learn that the President of Haiti, Jean Baptiste Riche, died at Port-au-Prince, on the 27th ultimo. Public tranquillity remains undisturbed. A letter in the Journal of Commerce from Jacmel says the name of the new President is Faustin Soulouque. He is about fifty years of age, well esteemed by the people, a man of good and amiable character, and distinguished for his firmness and courage.

General Items.

James Dixon, of Washington, and Gilbert Cameron, of this city, have taken the contract for the erection of the building for the Smithsonian Institute, at Washington. James Renwick, Jr. of this city, is the architect. The style is to be the Lombardy Norman.

The coloured people of Rochester have held a public meeting and adopted a letter to Gerrit Smith, acknowledging his bounty in giving them farms. Many of them express an intention of soon taking possession of their lands.

At Lafayette, Alabama, on the 26th ultimo, a negro woman belonging to a Mr. Whitehead, who lives some eight or ten miles south of that place, was committed to Jail, charged with the murder of three of her own children. The facts as established by strong circumstantial testimony, are as follows, viz: being under apprehension of a whipping from her master, for some misconduct, she started to run away, takin with her all her children, being four in number; on coming to a small creek she attempted to drown them all, but only succeeded in drowning three of them; the other, the oldest, escaped and fled home.—*New Haven Palladium.*

It is said that Lord Palmerston is about to demand the liberation of five thousand negroes, as English subjects, slaves in Cuba.

Pressnitz, the founder of the system of Water-Cure, is said to have had a dangerous attack of apoplexy.

Joseph Bonaparte's beautiful residence at Bordentown, on the Delaware, New Jersey, is to be sold at auction next June.

Fast Day in Maine.—Gov. Anderson, of Maine, has appointed the 8th day of April, as the annual day of fasting and other humiliations in Maine.

The barque Cactus, bound from Boston to Ireland, with provisions, was lost on Cape Cod on Monday of last week, and all on board perished.

Maine has contributed $6,600 for the relief of Ireland, $2 333 of which was contributed by the people of Portland.

Portsmouth, New Hampshire, has contributed $1,828.

Stock Company of Coloured Persons.—It is said that there is about to be established at South Trenton, a stock company consisting entirely of coloured persons. The object is to carry on the tanning business, with a capital of $6,000 divided into shares of $20. None but coloured persons are permitted to own stock. The shares are said to be nearly all taken up.—*Newark Advertiser.*

The Anti-Slavery Society of Delaware, held their monthly meeting at the Orange street school-house this week. They have appointed a committee to write communications for the papers of this State on the subject of Slavery. Also to collect statistics, details, &c. in relation to the same subject in our own State.—*Blue Hen's Chickens.*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

For Standard—from March 22d, to 38th, 1847.

Isaac Winslow, Boston, Mass.		$1 00
Jane O. Ferler, Marion, N. Y.		1 00
Zebina Howes, North Dennis, Mass.		50
Eleazur Paine, East Brewster,	"	1 00
Samuel Smith, West Harwich,	"	50
Benjamin F. Robbins, Harwich,	"	50
F. G. Shaw, West Roxbury,	"	1 00
George R. Russell,	" "	1 00
Albert Hubbard, Worcester, Mass.		1 00
Charles Perkins,	"	1 00
V. R. Bullard,	"	1 00
Wortman & Fuller,	"	1 00
L. & G. W. Bliss, North Montpelier, Vt.		1 00
P. A. Comstock, Hart's Village, N. Y.		2 00
Asa F. Johnson, Monroe, Me.		1 00
Prentice Kelley, Centreville, Mass.		1 00
James S. Pike, Calais, Me.		3 32
		18 82

Total Amount, $18 82
FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer.

NOTICES.

TO THE PUBLIC.

LAST week we commenced the publication of "THE DRAMA OF LIFE," an original tale of peculiar interest Those who wish to commence raking the paper with this new production, have now an opportunity of doing so, as we increased the edition for the accommodation of new subscribers. The publication of DOMBEY AND SON will be continued as heretofore, *without any abridgement of the usual contents of the paper.* Each part will be issued in an EXTRA as soon as it reaches this country, and distributed *gratuitously* to the subscribers of the HOME JOURNAL. By this arrangement our readers will receive this popular story at the earliest possible date, and sooner than it can be issued by any of the booksellers or publishing houses in the country. *To new subscribers, beginning with the last number, and remitting a year's subscription ($2) in advance, we will send* THE FIVE PARTS *already out,* GRATIS. Subscribe at the office of publication, No 107 Fulton street, and not at any other place in this city Will the editorial friends with whom we exchange, be kind enough to notice the foregoing announcement?

Home Journal.

MEETINGS FOR C. L. REMOND AND J. C. HATHAWAY.

TOMPKINS COUNTY.

Reynoldsville, Thursday and Friday, April 1 and 2.
Hector, Saturday and Sunday, April 3 and 4.
Burdette, Monday and Tuesday, April 5 and 6.

CHEMUNG COUNTY.

Catharines, Wednesday and Thursday, April 7 and 8.
Milport, Friday and Saturday, April 9 and 10.
Horse Heads, Sunday and Monday, April 11 and 12.
Elmira, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, April 13 14 and 15.

TOMPKINS COUNTY.

Ludlowville, Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, April 19, 20, and 21.

Meetings to commence at one and half-past six o'clock, P. M. J. C. HATHAWAY.

3d mo. 9, 1847.

MEETINGS.

W. W. Brown and Dr. Hudson will join each other on Tuesday, March 16th, and thereafter hold meetings in conjunction, as follows. The friends of the slave in the different places will not forget to anticipate their arrival, and make all the necessary arrangements for the meetings.

Litchfield, Wednesday, March	17th
Frankfort, Thursday and Friday,	18th and 19th
Mohawk, Saturday and Sunday,	20th and 21st
Herkirmer, Monday and Tuesday,	22d and 23d
Little Falls, Wed. and Thursday,	24th and 25th
Fairfield, Friday and Saturday,	26th and 27th
Middleville, Sunday,	28th
Newville, Monday and Tuesday,	29th and 30th
St. Johnsville, Wed. & Thur. March,	31st and April 1st.
Palatine, Frid. and Saturday, April,	2d and 3d
Fort Plain, Sunday and Monday,	4th and 5th
Johnstown, Tuesday and Wednesday,	6th and 7th
Mayfield, Thursday and Friday,	8th and 9th
Amsterdam, Saturday and Sunday,	10th and 11th
Schenectady, Monday and Tuesday,	12th and 13th
Albany, Wednesday and Thursday,	14th and 15th

Meetings to commence at one and half-past six, P. M.
Farmington, 2d mo. 11, 1847.
J. C. HATHAWAY, Gen. Agt. for N. Y.

ANNIVERSARY IN MAY.

The friends of the abolition of Capital Punishment throughout the United States, are earnestly requested to be represented at the meeting of the New-York State Society, to be held in this city on Monday, May the 10th. Among the speakers expected to address this meeting, are Hon. Robert Rantoul, Wendell Phillips, John Pierpont, Horace Greeley, Rev. E. H. Chapin, Charles C. Burleigh, Parke Godwin, J. L. O'Sullivan, Rev. W. H. Channing, and Prof. Patterson, of Philadelphia.

JOSIAH HOPPER, Sec. W. T. McCOUN, Pres.

☞ Papers friendly, please copy.

NEW-YORK WHOLESALE PRICES CURRENT.

CORRECTED WEEKLY FOR THE STANDARD.

ASHES.	
Duty, 20 per ct ad val. per 100lbs	
Pots, 1st sort 1846	7 4.81½ a 4.87½
Pearl	6 20 a 6 31
BEESWAX.	
Duty: 20 per cent. ad val.	
Cuba, white per lb	—.— a —.—
American, yellow,	—.27 a —.—
BRISTLES.	
Duty, 5 per cent ad val.	
St. Pet'sbg, 1st sort lb.	.90 a 1.12½
do. 2d sort	.35 a .45
Okatka, gray&white	1.90 a 1.95
Souchoy	60 a .65
American	55 a .60
COAL.	
Duty, 30 per cent. ad val.	
Liverpool, Orrel. chal	7.00 a 7.12½
Newcastle, coarse	6.00 a 6.12½
Scotch	6.00 a 6.50
Sidney and Pictou	6.00 a 6.25
Anthracite, 2,000lbs	6.00 a 6.50
DOMESTICS.	
Shirtings, brown 3-4 yd	5 a 6
do. do. 7-8	— a —
do. bleached	6 a 8
do. S. I. do.	7 a 11
Sheetings, brown 4-4	7 a 8½
do. do. 5-4	10 a 12
do. bleached 4-4	8 a 12
do. do. 5-4	12 a 15
Calicoes, blue	9 a 12
do. fancy	7 a 15
Plaids	9 a 11
Kentucky jeans,	15 a 30
Satinetts	25 a 60
Checks 4-4	8 a 10
Cotton Osnaburgs, No. 1	— a 9
do. No. 2	— a 8
Cotton yarn, 5 a 13	16 a 18
do. 14 a 19	18 a 22
do. 20 a 23	22 a 23
FLOUR & MEAL.	
Duty, 20 per cent ad val.	
Genesee per bbl.	6.87½ a 7.00
Troy	—.— a —.—
Michigan	6.93½ a 7.00
Ohio, flat hoop	6 93½ a 7.00
Ohio round hoop	—.— a —.—
Ohio, via N O	—.— a —.—
Pennsylvania	6.87½ a 7 00
Brandywine	6.62½ a —.—
Georgetown	6.6½ a —.—
Baltimore c. mills	6.50 a —.—
Richmond c. mills	8.00 a 8.50
do. country	6.75 a —.—
Alexandria	6.50 a —.—
Fredericksburg	6.50 a —.—
Petersburg	6.50 a —.—
Rye flour	4.87½ a 5.00
Cornmeal, Jersey

Poetry.

INGOLDSBY'S LAST POEM.

BY RICHARD HARRIS BARHAM.

As I laye a-thynkynge, a-thynkynge, a-thynkynge,
Merrie sang the birde as she sat upon the spraye;
There came a noble Knyghte,
With his hauberke shynynge bryghte,
And his gallant heart was lyghte,
Free and gaye;
As I laye a-thynkynge, he rode upon his waye.

As I laye a-thynkynge, a-thynkynge, a-thynkynge,
Sadly sang the birde as she sat upon the tree;
There seem'd a crimson plain,
Where a gallant Knyghte laye slayne,
And a steed with broken rein
Ran free,
As I laye a-thynkynge, most pitiful to see!

As I laye a-thynkynge, a-thynkynge, a-thynkynge,
Merrie sang the birde as she sat upon the boughe;
A lovely mayde came bye,
And a gentil youthe was nyghe,
And he breathed manie a syghe,
And a vow;
As I laye a-thynkynge, her heart was gladsome now.

As I laye a-thynkynge, a-thynkynge, a-thynkynge,
Sadly sang the birde as she sat upon the thorne;
No more a youthe was there,
But a mayden rent her haire,
"That I was borne!"
As I laye a-thynkynge, she perished forlorne.

As I laye a-thynkynge, a-thynkynge, a-thynkynge,
Sweetly sang the birde as she sat upon the brier;
There came a lovely childe,
And his face was meek and mild,
Yet joyously he smiled
On his sire;
As I laye a-thynkynge, a cherub mote admire.

But as I laye a-thynkynge, a-thynkynge, a-thynkynge,
And sadly sang the birde as it perch'd upon a bier;
That joyous smile was gone,
And the face was whyte and wan,
As the downe upon the Swan
Doth appear,
As I laye a-thynkynge, oh! bitter flowed the tear!

As I laye a-thynkynge, the golden sun was sinking,
O, merrie sang that birde as it glittered on her breast,
With a thousand gorgeous dyes,
While soaring to the skies,
'Mid the stars she seemed to rise,
As to her nest;
As I laye a-thynkynge her meaning was exprest;
"Follow, follow me away,
It boots not to delay,"—
'T was so she seemed to say,
"HERE IS REST!"

AN OLD POEM.

[The following is an excellent translation of a Latin Poem which has received the enthusiastic encomiums of Göethe, Dr. Johnson, Sir Walter Scott, and other distinguished men. It is said that Dr. Johnson always wept in reading the tenth stanza. The Earl of Roscommon expired with the seventeenth verse upon his lips. The original was written by a Monk in the thirteenth century. We find the translation in the Newark Daily Advertiser.—*Ed. Alb. Journal.*]

I.

Day of wrath, that day of burning
All shall melt, to ashes turning,
As foretold by Seers discerning.

II.

Oh, what fear shall it engender
When the Judge shall come in splendour,
Strict to mark and just to render.

III.

Trumpet scattering sounds of wonder,
Rending sepulchres asunder,
Shall resistless summons thunder.

IV.

All aghast then Death shall shiver,
And great Nature's frame shall quiver,
When the graves their dead deliver.

V.

Book where every act 's recorded,
All events all time afforded,
Shall be brought and dooms awarded.

VI.

When shall sit the Judge unerring,
He 'll unfold all here occurring,
No just vengeance then deferring.

VII.

What shall *I* say that time pending?
Ask what Advocate's befriending,
When the just man needs defending?

VIII.

King almighty and all-knowing,
Grace to sinners freely showing,
Save me, Fount of good o'erflowing.

IX.

Think, Oh, Jesus, for what reason
Thou endur'dest earth's spite and treason,
Nor me lose in that dread season.

X.

Seeking me Thy worn feet hasted,
On the cross Thy soul death tasted,
Let such labour not be wasted.

XI.

Righteous Judge of retribution,
Grant me perfect absolution,
Ere that day of execution.

XII.

Culprit-like, I—heart all broken,
On my cheek shame's crimson token—
lead the pardoning word be spoken.

XIII.

Thou who Mary gav'st remission,
Heard'st the dying Thief's petition,
Cheer with hope my lost condition.

XIV.

Though my prayers do nothing merit,
What is needful Thou confer it—
Lest I endless fire inherit.

XV.

Mid the sheep a place decide me,
And from goats on left divide me,
Standing on the right beside Thee.

XVI.

When th' accurs'd away are driven,
To eternal burnings given,
Call me with the bless'd to Heav'n.

XVII.

I beseech Thee, prostrate lying,
Heart as ashes contrite, sighing,
Care for me when I am dying.

XVIII.

On that awful day of wailing,
Human destinies unveiling,
When man rising, stands before Thee,
Spare the Culprit, God of glory. A. C.

Miscellany.

[Abridged from the London Quarterly Review.]

RAGGED SCHOOLS.

It is a curious race of human beings that these philanthropists (the founders of ragged schools) have taken in hand. Everybody who walks the streets of the metropolis must daily observe several members of the tribes—bold, and pert, and dirty as London sparrows, but pale, feeble, and sadly inferior to them in plumpness of outline. Their business, or pretended business, seems to vary with the locality. At the West-end, they deal in lucifer matches, audaciously beg, or tell a touching tale of woe. Pass on to the central parts of the town—to Holborn or the Strand, and the regions adjacent to them—and you will there find the numbers very greatly increased. A few are pursuing the avocations above mentioned, of their more Corinthian fellows; many are spanning the gutters with their legs, and dabbling with earnestness in the latest accumulation of nastiness, while others, in squalid and half-naked groups, squat at the entrances of the narrow fœtid courts and alleys which lie concealed behind the deceptive frontages of our larger thoroughfares. Whitechapel and Spitalfields teem with them like an ant's nest; but it is in Lambeth and in Westminster that we find the most flagrant traces of their swarming activity. There the foul dismal passages are thronged with childien of both sexes, and of every age, from three to thirteen. Though wan and haggard, they are singularly vivacious, and engaged in every sort of occupation but that which would be beneficial to themselves and creditable to the neighbourhood. Their appearance is wild; the matted hair, the disgusting filth that renders necessary a closer inspection, before the flesh can be discerned between the rags which hang about it; and the barbarian freedom from all superintendence and restraint, fill the mind of a novice in these things with perplexity and dismay. Visit these regions in summer, and you are overwhelmed with exhalations; visit them in winter, and you are shocked by the spectacle of hundreds shivering in apparel that would be scanty in the tropics; many are all but naked; those that are clothed are grotesque; the trowsers, where they have them, seldom pass below the knee; the tail coats very frequently trail below the heels. In this guise they run about the streets, and line the banks of the river at low water, seeking coals, sticks, corks, for nothing comes amiss as treasure-trove; screams of delight burst occasionally from the crowds, and leave the passer by, if he be in a contemplative mood, to wonder and rejoice that physical and moral degradation have not broken down every spring of their youthful energies.

Eccentric doubts flit through our minds; and we are tempted to ask whether these nondescripts ever had a parent, or whether there be parents to be found in the district. "They look not like the inhabitants o' the earth, and yet are on 't." A feeling of curiosity arises, and the next step is to investigate their natural history, their haunts, their habits, their idiosyncrasy, their points of resemblance to the rest of mankind, and the part they sustain in the great purpose of creation. The stranger dives into the recesses from which they seem to issue, and there he sees, before and behind, on the right hand and on the left, every form and character of evil that can offend the sense and deaden the morals.

* * * * *

But these creatures have pursuits of their own, certain occupations whereby they obtain a scanty subsistence; for, though there are, perhaps, many persons who may not admit the necessity, they themselves have a conviction that they must live. The children that survive the noxious influences and awful neglect, are thrown, as soon as they can crawl, to scramble in the gutter, and leave their parents to amusement or business; as they advance in years, they discover that they must, in general, find their own food, or go without it. The "duris urgens in rebus egestas," stimulates these independent urchins, and at an age when the children of the wealthy would still be in leading strings, they are off, singly or in parties, to beg, borrow, steal, and exercise all the cunning that want and a love of evil can stir up in a reckless race. They are driven to these courses, in many instances, by their parents; in more, by their step-mothers; in most by necessity and general example. The passion for shows and the lowest drama is nearly universal; "Panem et Circenses,"—food and the penny theatres—these are their paradise, and the chief temptation to crime. They receive no education, religious or secular; they are subjected to no restraint of any sort; never do they hear the word of advice, or the accent of kindness; the notions that exist in the minds of ordinary persons have no place in theirs; having nothing exclusively their own, they seem to think such, in fact, the true position of society; and, helping themselves without scruple to the goods of others, they can never recognize, when convicted before a magistrate, the justice of a sentence which punishes them for having done little more than was indispensable to their existence.

Well, then, we discover that they are beings like ourselves; that they have long subsisted within a walk of our own dwellings; that they have increased and are increasing in numbers with the extension of this overgrown metropolis; and that they recede, if to recede be possible, in physical and moral condition, as the capital itself advances towards the pinnacle of magnificence and refinement. Will no one roll away the reproach? We have an established church, abundant in able and pious men, and she boasts herself to be the Church of the people. We have a great body of wealthy and intelligent dissenters, who declaim by day and by night, on the efficacious virtues of the voluntary principle. We have a generous aristocracy and plethoric capitalists, and a Government pledged to social improvements.—Who will come forward? Why not all?

The ragged schools owe their origin to some excellent persons in humble life, who went forth into the streets and alleys, not many years ago, and invited these miserable outcasts to listen to the language of sympathy and care. We are not able to say when exactly the first beginning was made, nor to apportion the merit of the earlier efforts; but praise and fame are the last things such men thought or think of. Much, no doubt, must be ascribed to the zealous humanity of the city missionaries. It is certain that those who undertook the task were of various denominations—church people and dissenters—animated, all of them, by a common sentiment of compassion and piety, which they proved by the ready and liberal contributions for this good purpose from their precarious and scanty earnings. Rooms were hired in the worst localities, and at the cheapest rate; lights provided; and Sunday after Sunday, as the evening closed in, a band of volunteers, teachers, both male and female, continued to struggle, in patience and faith, against the repulsive difficulties of their obscure occupation. It would be curious to see a minute record in print of the events that attended the opening of any one school; of the noise, confusion, and violence that have, as we believe, signalized the commencement of nearly all of them. We have just seen a gentleman who came, in breathless dismay, to announce the misconduct of the boys in a school recently opened. "The neighbours," said he, "are alarmed—the landlord will close the doors—the teachers will flee."—"Well," we replied, "you have only added another instance to the many we had already heard of; you cannot have a ragged school without its preliminaries; but persevere, as others have done, and you will soon overcome the tumult; those who came for a lark will be wearied out and stay away; those who have the least hankering after better things, will remain and obey you." Such is the general course of events in all the most degraded localities; we have heard the various teachers narrate most graphically the drummings at the doors, the rattling at the windows, by those who demanded admittance; the uproar of their entry; the immediate extinction of the lamps; the dirt and stones that flew in all directions; rendering this service of love in no slight degree a service of danger. Oftentimes these lads got possession of the apartments; and refusing either to learn or to retire, continued lords paramount until the arrival of the police. But patience and principle have conquered them all; and now we may see on each evening of the week, hundreds of these young maniacs engaged in diligent study, clothed, and in their right mind.

Ladies and gentlemen who walk in purple and fine linen, and fare sumptuously every day, can form no adequate idea of the pain and the toil which the founders and conductors of these schools have joyfully sustained in their simple and fervent piety. Surrendering nearly the whole of the Sabbath, their only day of rest, and often after many hours of toil, giving besides, an evening in the week, they have plunged into the foulest localities, fœtid apartments, and harassing duties. We have heard of schoolrooms so closely packed, that three lads have sat in the fire-place, one on each hob, and the third in the grate, with his head up the chimney; and frequent are the occasions on which the female teachers have returned to their homes covered with the vermin of their tattered pupils. All this they have done, and still do, in the spirit of genuine Christian charity, without the hope of recompense, of money or of fame. It staggers, at first, our belief, but nevertheless it is true; and many a Sunday-school teacher, thus poor and zealous, will rise up in judgment with lazy ecclesiastics, boisterous sectarians, and self-seeking statesmen.

* * * * *

It is worth our while to devote a few moments to the details that exhibit the social condition of a large part of these children. We have been unable, through want of time, to obtain minute returns from every school; the statements, however, with which we are furnished, may, we believe, be relied on as supplying a just notion of the whole mass. We have examined 15 schools, and have arrived at an amount of 2,345 children and young persons between the ages of 5 and 17, with some few even older, who are occasional hearers. The number of average attendants will be less by at least one-third, or about 1,600. Now, of these we find that 162 confess that they have been in prison, 116 have run away from their homes, 170 sleep in lodging houses (the chief sinks of iniquity in the metropolis); 253 live by begging, 216 have no shoes or stockings, 280 have no hat, cap, or bonnet, 101 have no body linen, 249 have never slept in beds; 68 are the children of convicts; 125 have lost one or both parents, a large proportion having lost both.

Here is subject-matter enough for the sentimental, for spare tears and wandering sympathies! Those who, amidst the enjoyment of existence, seek the luxury of woe in a poem or a romance, may learn that the realities of life are more touching than fiction; and the practical alleviation of sorrow quite as delightful as the happy conclusion of a novel. We must, too, have political economy on our side, for, whatever it may determine respecting the ragged and the mendicant, it can give but one judgment touching those who are the children of convicts, and those who have no parents, or whose parents have forced them to the perpetration of crime. There is a beautiful text, "When my father and my mother forsake me, then the Lord will take me up." (Psalm xxvii.) Society has been ordained by God for the benefit of his creatures; and it should, therefore, enter into the spirit of his laws with a heart of devout and affectionate imitation.

The habits of their daily life, the associations they necessarily form, are all alike in the way of the teacher; the lessons of the evening are reversed by the practice of the following day—passed, too, probably, amidst the lowest scenes of vice and revelry. If kept at home, they are witnesses of all that is most vile in language and conduct; if sent abroad, it is to beg on prepared falsehoods—or cheat methodically in their small trades, or steal for immediate consumption or for sale at the receiving-shop. Hence the difficulty of infusing into these wanderers a sense of shame, and delicate notions of "meum and tuum!" Having nothing of their own, they are under no terrors of the law of retaliation; being destitute of common necessaries they cannot recognize the exclusive possession of superfluities; and so, less with a desire to infringe another man's rights than to assert what they consider to be their own, they help themselves to everything that comes in their way. They make little or no secret of their successful operations, cloaking them only with euphoneous terms; they "find" everything—they "take" nothing; no matter the bulk or quality of the article, it was "found," sometimes nearly a side of bacon, just at the convenient time and place; and many are the loud and bitter complaints that the "dealer in marine stores," (receiver of stolen goods,) is utterly dishonest, and has given for the thing but half the price that could be got in the market.

Nor does punishment humble them more effectually than crime; they see in it less of the justice of the law, than of the skill of the policeman; they have been found out, and sentenced accordingly; that is the plain statement of the case, and they seldom conceal it. Oftentimes have we heard an able and amiable barrister—one who takes a deep interest in these schools—relate that, in passing through the by-streets and alleys, he has been saluted by some wild urchin with, "How do ye do, Mr. P.——?" "Very well, I thank you; but how do you know me?" "Know you! why, but the other day you got me off at the Old Bailey!" Indeed, it not unfrequently happens that the boys, on quitting the prisons, will march straight to the schools, and resume their accustomed places, with an apology to the teacher—"Sorry I could not come before; had ten days of Bridewell." We must add a little anecdote recorded by one of the city missionaries. "This kind and worthy man had endeared himself to the whole of his district, and specially to the younger population. One evening, having put on a new coat, he went, about dusk, through a remote street, and was instantly marked as a quarry by one of these rapacious vagabonds. The urchin did not know him in his new attire, and, therefore, without hesitation relieved his pockets of their contents. The missionary did not discover his loss, nor the boy his victim, until, in his flight, he had reached the end of the street. He then looked round, and recognized, in the distance, his old friend and teacher; he ran back to him breathless—"Holloa," said he, "is it you, Mr. M——? I did not know you in your new coat; here's your handkerchief for you!" Why, surely, here are the practices and morals of violent and ignorant times; of the ancient Greeks and modern Dyaks!

The affection they entertain for their teachers is very striking, based, in a great measure, on the unhappy fact that, except from these devoted missionaries, they have never enjoyed the language of kindness. It is peculiar, and expressed after the fashion of their rough nature. A short time ago, the night having set in, we were passing through a dark street to the inspection of a school, when a gentleman in the company was addressed with "How are you, there?" He looked at the lad, who turned from him with evident displeasure, saying, "Oh, I thought you were a teacher; if you had been, I'd have shaken hands with you." This may be a small fact in itself, but it is a mighty one to show the power of sympathy over these Arabs of the metropolis.

Nor is the effect transient. Several have been placed in situations, humble, it is true, but vastly superior to the condition whence they sprung. We have traced without surprise, sundry instances of disappointment; but we could, on the other hand, detail many examples, and especially among the females, of real and lasting amelioration; and the teachers are rewarded by frequent expressions of approval from those who have admitted on trial these poor children to their service. We may rejoice, too, that the pattern, exhibited in London, has been imitated, where it is so greatly needed, in Birmingham, Manchester, and Liverpool. The history of the efforts at Aberdeen, and the successful results that attended the industrial school in that place, will repay any reader of the statements in a late number of *Chambers's Edinburgh Journal*; and we hope it will not be long before we hear of the good example being followed in Edinburgh and Glasgow.

A scheme is now on foot for the establishment of an industrial day school (a model, we trust, to many others,) to be planted in the worst locality in the metropolis, and appropriated to the reception of the most vagabond and destitute boys, who will be trained, not only in the elements of ordinary instruction, but to the knowledge and practice of some trade or calling. None but the most destitute must be admitted; none but those whose wretched circumstances seem to place them beyond the possibilities of virtue. The school must stand in the very midst of the district not planted in some remote corner of the county; it must be so placed as to hold forth a constant example, and act beneficially, even on the parents themselves, by the daily exhibition of improved and improving children.

From the Cherokee Advocate.

DEATH OF THE BIG SOLDIER.

The Big Soldier was the head warrior of the great Osage village. In council he sat next to Whitehair, the Head Chief or King. In war he led the braves and warriors to battle. In council he was shrewd and influential; in battle, brave and persevering; and in his family humane and affectionate. His speeches in council were filled with allegories, the product of his original, inventive imagination. These he told to illustrate his fears of evil, or to push forward some favourite scheme. As a warrior, he planned intriguingly, but executed boldly. He decoyed his enemies to the ambush, but would not use his covert to destroy them; but marched forth boldly from behind to the battle, tomakawk in hand. It was his daring defiance that overawed his enemy, and gave him signal success.

My friend was so interested with his speech on first meeting the missionaries, August, 1821, that he noted it down for after reference.

"BROTHERS:—When I heard you were coming, I was very glad—for I thought it would be good to have men among us who had *power* with God, (praying men.) When I heard you had come I was many days' ride away in our wide hunting grounds. I laid down my gun upon the first notice, and nasted on my journey to see you. The first days I rode joyfully to see the men that would *move God*. But last night a man met me, a stranger and a strange man, and he told me 'you might not be good men—not good for the Osages as your name seemed to tell. You might be men to search out the land in disguise, and to scheme to get it away from us, the rightful owners, and to make our children slaves, instead of teaching them the white man's learning, and about the white man's God.'

"We want to know what good your God will do us. Our God (Wah-ken-dah) is good to us. We see him in the earth, in the sun, in the moon and stars, in the fire, in the lightning, in the rain; and we hear him in the clouds, making long and loud talk to his red children. In the summer time before he comes down in rain, he speaks, and tells us to be glad, he is coming to make the corn grow. He has been speaking loud and often lately, and sending big rain to swim your big canoes up our river, that you might come into our country; and this seems that Wah-ken-dah is good to you, too; and I will believe him. I will not believe the man that met me; for I was asleep when he told me you might be men of the evil spirit's sending—for men, when they tell news to sleeping men, often tell lies. But I will believe Wah-ken-dah, for he has kept you and your women, and babies, safely from all harm, during four long moons, while you were coming on the long and dangerous waters: for he told us you were coming, in his talk in the clouds every week, before he sent the big rains to swim you on; and I will believe you are good men and women, and will try you. You may stop on this level meadow; and when you get rested, our people will come and hear about your God; and may be, if we like, we will let some of our smartest children come and learn with you. You must be patient, and we will watch you, and ask Wah-ken-dah to be good to you, too; for he is good to the good Osage, sends plenty of game to him; and will give him, when he dies, evergreen hunting grounds, without any winter, abundance of deer, always fat, and friends that will bring 'heaps' of blankets and tobacco. We will want to hear what your God will give to dead men in the coming world."

The missionaries did settle, and the Big Soldier did watch them, and try them, by sending a son, not of a favourite wife, to their school: but the children of his favourite wife he could not send, they were too precious to him; he could not be separated from them even for such a purpose.

This Chief had lived till past middle age, and made himself noted in council, and in war; but it yet remained for him so to distinguish himself in his domestic circle that he would be the song of the hero for coming generations. His wife was the dearest object to him on earth. She now seemed to him his whole world. He had married her after the custom of his nation at great cost. Joyfully they lived together; but the blight of sickness came, which only tended to rivet his affections the stronger. Anxiously and constantly did he watch over his sick and dying wife. Large premiums did he offer to the medicine men to save her. They used their incantations, their deepest arts, with howlings inhuman, and tears, to no avail. Death took his victim, and the Big Soldier seemed to acquiesce. He had her buried in the most expensive and respectful manner, after the custom of his nation. The idolized wife was dead and buried; but the Big Soldier had yet to give to the world his manifestation of the strength of his affection—*he was to die, too.* Not by the stab of steel, grasped and plunged to the heart in a frenzied fit of disappointment; not by the murderous bullet, hurled through the brain by the aid of fire-arms, in a moment while his reason was reeling; but deliberately did he stretch his soldier body upon the wife's new-made grave, and neither ate nor drank, and there he died. Neither the remonstrances of his friends and relatives, nor the threatened interference of the Chief, produced the slightest wavering in his determination. He only assigned this reason for his strange act, that he knew if he had died first, her love for him was so great that she would have died for him; and that he could not do anything less in manifesting his love for her, as she had started first to the new hunting grounds, than to lay down his life in this old land, and to take the journey with her to the new, never-failing, and delightful hunting regions.

PAH-HU-SKAH.

From the New-York Evening Post, October, 1812.

THE VIRGINIA NEGRO'S SONG.

Passing, lately, by a mansion of opulence, where the lordlings of the South riot in luxury, at the expense of the "black man's toils," my attention was arrested by the plaintive strains of an African slave in an adjoining field, on whose cheek the tear mingled with his sweat. My ear caught the following fragment of the poor negro's song:

Sad and hungry—all forlorn,
Negro work from early morn:
Drear the day and sad the night,
Negro's woes find no respite.

If I toil, I nothing gain,
Joy ne'er comes to pay for pain;
Master whip me when he like;
Kill me if I dare to strike.

I love Dinah—she love me;
We had little children three;
Dinah's sold—and we must part;
O it breaks poor Sambo's heart!
White man talk of liberty!
Why not negro too be free?

The lash of the driver forced a scream of anguish that moment from Sambo, and I heard no more.

From "The Adventures of a Lady in Search of a good Servant, by one who has almost been bored to death."

CHOICE CHERRY BRANDY.

We were, at one time, as many as fourteen in the drawing-room, and all of them highly desirable acquaintances, being people very well to do in the world; when mamma, who is so proud of her cherry-brandy, would persuade our friends to take some, if it was only a glassful. So (bother take it!) I had to get my keys, and trot down stairs for her stupid cherry brandy—which I'm sure I couldn't see the want of, for there was plenty of excellent red and white wine on the table; and that was good enough for any one any day, I should think. Besides, I had set my mind upon keeping the cherry-brandy quietly to myself, as there were only two bottles of it, and Edward had just laid in several dozen of port and sherry. However, I returned with one of the bottles and an agreeable smile on my countenance to the drawing-room, little thinking that I was about to present some of my best friends with a glass of that horrible wash that that tipsy, thieving Mary had filled up the bottle with. Then giving it to mamma, I told her pleasantly that she should fill the glasses, and have all the credit of it to herself. So, the good, dear old lady did as I said, and handing it round, observed to Mrs. L—chl—y (who is the wife of Edward's best client, and of highly genteel connexions,) that she should like her to try that; for she flattered herself that she would find it very fine, and not to be got everywhere, as she had made it herself, after her own peculiar way; and that she felt convinced that any pastry-cook would gladly give her twenty guineas for the receipt any morning; and that she always made a point of using none but the very best cognac that could be got for money, together with the finest Morella cherries that were to be picked up in Covent-garden Market. When they had all got their glasses, dear, unconscious mamma sat down with a self-contented smile, waiting for the approbation and eulogiums which she confidently expected they would overwhelm her with. As soon as Mrs. L—ckl—y had taken one cherry and a spoonful of the wash, all the rest followed her example. Dear mamma observing that Mrs. L—ckl—y made a wry face after it, (as well the poor thing might,) said, 'I'm afraid the brandy is too strong for you, Mrs. L—ckl—y; but you needn't be afraid of it, my dear—a bottle of such as that would not hurt you, I can assure you. Now, really, I shall begin to think you don't like it, if you don't finish it. On which Mrs. L—ckl—y (who is an extremely well-bred woman) answered, 'You're very good—it is very nice, I'm sure. And then the poor thing put another spoonfull of the filthy stuff to her lips. Whereupon poor, dear mamma (who was determined not to be balked out of the compliments she innocently thought she was entitled to) tried to prevail on some of the other poor things (who really, considering all, had borne it like martyrs,) to go on with theirs. But Mrs. B—yl—a politely excused herself by saying she thought it was not quite so rich as some of mother's that she had had the pleasure of tasting before, and that sweet woman, Mrs. C—rt—r, said that she was afraid the brandy had gone off a little, (and so it had, with a vengeance.) On which Edward, (lawyer like,) fancying something was wrong, and thinking it a good opportunity for teasing his poor, dear, innocent mother-in-law, took a glass himself, and had no sooner tasted it, than, instead of swallowing it like a gentleman, he spit the whole into the fire-place, declaring he had never in all his life tasted such beastly trash. Whereupon dear mamma, who believed that he only said as much to annoy her, took a glassful likewise; and scarcely had she put her lips to it, than she gave a scream, and the poor dear soul, spluttered it all out of her mouth again, exclaiming, "Oh that shameful minx of a Mary! I know it's her,—the drunken hussy! If she hasn't been and drunk all the brandy, and filled the bottle up again with what I'd swear was nasty filthy cold tea, and unripe cherries." No sooner had she made the discovery, than all the poor dear ladies who had partaken of the filthy mixture uttered a piercing scream, while that unfeeling wretch, Edward, rushed out of the room, and I could actually hear the brute bursting with laughter on the landing-place.

All the dears agreed with poor mamma—who was boiling over, (if I might be allowed the expression,) that it was very shameful conduct on the part of the maid, and hoped that mamma would not let it take any effect upon her on their account, as really they did n't mind about it. And then taking a glass of sherry wine a-piece, just to take the taste out of their dear mouths, they all hurried away, and in less than ten minutes we were left alone in the drawing-room.

Then we both agreed to make that cat, Mary, finish before our very eyes the whole of the other bottleful, (which we made up our minds she had of course served in the same manner,) and directly after she had eaten it all up, to give her warning, as it would be the best way of punishing her for her wicked goings-on. So down stairs we went, and having got the bottle out of the store-room closet, we made the wretch devour the whole of it on the spot—though from the ready way in which the minx resigned herself to her fate, and from the effect it had upon her shortly afterwards, (for it only made her more tipsy than before,) to our horror we found out that she had never touched that bottle at all—and, indeed, she told us as much when she had drunk up every drop, and had the impudence to say she should like to be punished again. So we immediately gave her warning, and told her not to think of sending to us for a character, indeed. But in the evening, the cherry-brandy we had forced her to take, made her so dreadfully bad, that we had to carry her up stairs and put her to bed again. All of which was a mere nothing to us, compared with the good humor it put Edward into; who kept telling us, with a nasty vulgar giggle, that we ought to be ashamed of ourselves for driving the poor girl into another fit; and he hoped that dear mamma would take care that the next servant she engaged for him was n't subject to epilepsy (an aggravating monster!)

Gleanings from Foreign Papers.

The last of the Kembles—Mrs. Butler (whilome Miss Fanny Kemble)—made her re-appearance on the stage, at Manchester, on Tuesday night. The manager of Drury Lane Theatre had been previously in treaty with Mrs. Butler, but they disagreed as to terms. The *Manchester Guardian* of Wednesday gives the following account of the performance, which was Sheridan Knowles's play of the *Hunchback*—Mrs. Butler having selected the character of *Julia* for her second *debut*:—"When Mrs. Butler appeared in the first scene she was received with a burst of applause, which, for its force and cordiality, appeared both to surprise and deeply to affect her, and it was some minutes after she had returned her mute but eloquent thanks before she perfectly regained her composure. She looks much thinner than when we saw her last, in 1832, and her features bear traces of chequered health and of much thoughtfulness. In the first scene she describes to *Helen*, with girlish artlessness, the charms of a country life. It seemed to want somewhat of the gushing joyousness of the spring of life, but the scene was played with taste. Subsequently, when *Clifford* appears in the same scene, her mingled embarrassment and pleasure—the first promptings of youthful love—were beautifully discriminating and chaste. In the fourth act there was much forcible acting, and in the course of her interview with *Clifford*, who comes as his rival's secretary, to present a letter to *Julia*, her exclamation, 'Clifford, is it thou?' and her start, when he coldly asks her for 'The answer to my lord,' were among the most heart-speaking touches of the whole play. In the last act, *Julia* makes her appeal to the *Hunchback* to save her from 'these hated nuptials.' There was much beauty in Mrs. Butler's acting throughout, mingled with what we venture to consider some defects. Her elocution is beautiful, her voice is light and silvery, fitted more for the expression of the gentler emotions than for deep passion; but she manages that, and certain other physical characteristics, with admirable tact. Most of the other parts were well played; and the piece was admirably dressed and produced. There was a crowded and brilliant house." Mrs. Butler was announced to appear on the same stage as *Juliana* on Thursday last, and will subsequently perform *Lady Macbeth*, *Juliet*, *Lady Teazle*, and *Queen Catherine* in Shakspeare's *Henry VIII.*

MINERAL WEALTH OF GREAT BRITAIN.—In the course of a lecture, delivered to the general classes of King's College, by Mr. Tennant, on mineralogical geology, the lecturer stated that the annual value of the mineral produce of this country amounts to about 25,000,000*l.*—of this, 9,000,000*l.* is from coals; 3,400,000*l.* from iron; 1,200,000*l.* from copper; 920,000*l.* from lead; 400,000*l.* from salt; 390,000*l.* from tin; 60,000*l.* from manganese; 35 000*l.* from silver; 22,000*l.* from alum; 8 000*l.* from zinc; and 25,000*l.* from various other metals, as antimony, besmith, arsenic, &c.

BURNS'S ANNIVERSARY.—LAYING THE FOUNDATION STONE OF A LARGE HALL AT BURNS'S COTTAGE.—On Monday, the anniversary of our national poet, Robert Burns, was celebrated at his birthplace, Alloway, in a two-fold manner. The proprietors of the cottage and land surrounding it (the Incorporation of Shoemakers of Ayr) have for some time contemplated building a large hall, in connection with the cottage, for the purpose of holding meetings, dinners, &c.; and having completed their arrangements, they selected the anniversary day as the most appropriate on which to lay the foundation stone. At six o'clock, about thirty gentlemen sat down to dinner, in the large room of the cottage, M. Dick, Esq. in the chair.—*Dumfries Herald.*

BOW STREET IN THE OLDEN TIME.—Wycherley, ("The Plain Dealer,") a dandy and courtier, as well as author, had lodgings in Bow street, where Charles II. once visited him, when ill, and gave him five hundred pounds, to go to the south of France for his health. When he afterwards married the Countess of Drogheda, a young, rich, and beautiful widow, she went to live with him in Bow street. She was very jealous, and when he went over to the Cock Tavern, opposite his house, he was obliged to make the drawer open his windows, that his lady might see that there was no woman in the company. This Cock Tavern was the great resort of the rakes and Mohocks of that day. Buckhurst, Sedley, Killigrew, &c. In fact, Bow street was then the Bond street of London, and the Cock, its Long's or Clarendon. Like most places where the rich congregate, this fashionable quarter was a fine field for the ingenuity of pickpockets, and especially of the wig and sword stealers, a class of thieves that disappeared with full-bottomed periwigs and silver-hilted rapiers. In those days to keep a man's head decently covered cost nearly as much as it does now to fill his belly and clothe his back. Wigs were sometimes of the value of 40*l.* or 50*l.*; 10*l.* or 15*l.* was a very low figure for these modest incumbrances. Out of respect to such costly head-dresses, hats were generally worn under the arm. The wig-stealers could ask no more.

[It was of Wycherley that the story is told, that being one day in a bookseller's shop, in the height of the run of his comedy of the Plain Dealer, the Countess of Drogheda came in and asked the bookseller for "the Plain Dealer;" upon which he turned to Wycherley, and said, "Madam, that is the Plain Dealer!" The upshot was that she took the author, who was an exceedingly handsome man, instead of the play, or along with it. Notwithstanding her jealousy, she left him her fortune at her death; but it was an unlucky gift, for it involved him in lawsuits with the heirs at law, in consequence of which he lay in gaol seven years, till released by James II.

Apropos to the wig-stealers, the following extract from "Nollekens and his Times" is in point. Mrs. Nollekens has frequently been heard to relate that during the early part of Mr. Welch's magistracy, gentlemen were constantly annoyed, and frequently robbed of their wigs in open street and mid-day. She stated that this method of wig-stealing was singularly daring as well as laughably curious. A man dressed like a baker, bending beneath a large loaded bread-basket, which he had hoisted upon his shoulders, waited until the first gentleman wearing a costly wig was about to turn the corner of a street in a crowded thoroughfare, and then, just as an accomplice ran against him, a boy, concealed in the baker's basket, knocked off the gentleman's gold-laced hat, and instantly snatched off his wig. Whilst the gentleman was stooping to pick up his hat, the fictitious baker made off with his dextrous assistant till he came to the first convenient turning, where he released the boy, who walked away with his booty neatly folded up in a schoolboy's satchel, which he threw carelessly over his shoulder, as if slowly going to school, "with shining morning face;" leaving the baker with a loaf or two in his basket, pretending to be waiting at a customer's door."]—COMMUNICATED.

CONSUMPTION OF SMOKE.—A patent has been obtained by Messrs. W. G. and W. Taylor, for an invention to be applied to all furnaces constructed in the ordinary manner with open ash-pits, for effecting a more perfect combustion of the inflammable gases and unconsumed carbon. In consists, first, in the application of an exhausting and blowing apparatus; and, secondly, in a peculiar distribution or arrangement of the smoke flues, so as to be adapted to the operation of such apparatus. A fan, or blower, is applied to the flue just before the entrance to the chimney, to arrest the smoke and unconsumed gases, and force them through a flue, leading therefrom, and opening on, to the dead plate at or near the front of the fire bars. By this means the whole is passed over the incandescent fuel, where it is consumed, instead of passing up the chimney unconsumed.—*Mining Journal.*

LIBERTY.—If men are to wait for liberty till they become wise and good in slavery, they may wait for ever.—*Macaulay.*

A farmer's daughter lately paid a grocer in Halifax, about £90 in fourpenny pieces, the price of two hogsheads of sugar. The fair economist had been laying by the small pieces of silver for some time. The money was wheel-barrowed into Halifax.

The Aulic Chancery at Vienna has published a decree which subjects the homœpathic doctors to a more severe control. Formerly they were allowed to prepare their own medicines; they are in future obliged to procure their ingredients and medicaments from the apothecaries.

IBRAHIM PACHA carried into Egypt, among other things, the Electric Telegraph. He also took with him a better thing. He caught a horror of Slavery in the atmosphere of freedom; and, since his return to Egypt, *has enfranchised all the slaves in his service.*

STRANGE ITEMS.—It is estimated that the amount annually expended in New-York city for cigars is not less than $730,000. It is also said that 17,000 sacks of sawdust are annually consumed in London alone, for *stuffing dolls.*

THE DURATION OF MARRIED LIFE.—The life tables show that in this country (England) husbands and wives married at the age of twenty-six live, on an average, twenty-seven years together, the widows living rather more than ten years after their husbands' deaths, and the widowers, nearly nine after the death of their wives. Where the husbands forty and the wife thirty, the mean term of married life is twenty-one years, the widows living thirteen years after their husbands, and the widowers five years after their wives.

MUNICH.—Theodore Lenefelder, Royal Lithographical inspector, and the last of the five brothers of the inventor of lithography, died here, November 19th, in the seventieth year of his age.

BARBARISM.—THE SCOTT MONUMENT.—The corners of mouldings and pieces of carved seats, in several of the galleries of this splendid work of art, have been chipped off, while letters have been rudely scratched into the stone in different parts of the building.

SPEED OF PIGEONS.—A few days ago a pigeon flew from Buxton, near London, to Brighton, in less than an hour, though the distance is not less than fifty-two miles.

The value of the library bequeathed by the Rt. Hon. T. Grenville to the British Museum is estimated at £100.000; the number of volumes is 20,-300, some of them of exceeding rarity, the "Mazarine Bible," for instance, is valued at £200.

Douglas Jerrold, speaking of railroads, says:—Wordsworth poured forth his indignant spleen lest Windermere and Rydal should be degraded by the presence of a thousand holyday folks freed from the steaming hives of Lancashire, to enjoy one day with God's beautiful works among the lakes and mountains of Cumberland—astonishing obliquity in one so gifted. His great human heart, instead of growling, should have expanded with the thought that thousands by the aid of steam would in one day's emancipation from loom and anvil, gain health, strength, and wisdom, as they luxuriated among that glorious scenery, which has so long inspired his lofty muse and fed his poetic fancy. That their good would be his immortality. Thousands would be induced to read his works who theretofore had hardly heard his name. Let us hope that he has become wiser, as the peers have: but these are of the past, let us look at the present.

A SOUTHERN MINISTER IN 1796.—A friend of the slave in Somerville has furnished us with the following interesting fact, concerning Mr. Tait, of Beaufort, South Carolina, first published in a Southern paper in the year 1796, under the head of deaths: "In his will was the following remarkable clause—I enjoin it upon my executors to publish it in all the papers in Charles Town, that I die under the full conviction that I should not be admissible to the kingdom of heaven if I departed this life